MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., October 6, 1950

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1951, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, October 6, 1950. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Prof. Hudnut,
Mr. Belluschi,
Mr. deWeldon,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. Biddle,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on July 20, 1950, were approved.

2. BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1952: The Secretary submitted the Budget of the Commission of Fine Arts for the fiscal year 1952, namely, from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, in the amount of $27,000 (Exhibit A), for ratification and approval by the Commission. Under a law of Congress estimates for a succeeding fiscal year must be submitted by September 15th of each year.

Chairman Finley stated that the Budget of $27,000 is not large, though more than twice the amount appropriated by Congress for the current fiscal year, namely, $12,530. It provides for modest increases, and makes adequate provision for increased travel expenses. Also it provides for much needed clerical assistance. Congress recently enacted legislation to protect "Historic Georgetown," which will further increase the work of the Commission.

The Commission examined the Budget and approved it.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., October 6, 1950

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1951, was held in the Office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, October 6, 1950. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Prof. Frankl,
Mr. Hallinan,
Mr. Donaldson,
Dr. Reese,
Mr. Biddle,

also H. L. Dammeron, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The minutes of the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held on July 20, 1950, were approved.

2. BUDGET FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1952: The Secretary submitted the Budget of the Commission of Fine Arts for the fiscal year 1952, namely, from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, in the amount of $27,000 (Exhibit A), for ratification and approval by the Commission. Under a law of Congress estimates for a succeeding fiscal year must be submitted by September 15th of each year.

Chairman Finley stated that the Budget of $27,000 is not large, being more than twice the amount appropriated by Congress for the current fiscal year, namely, $12,730. It provides for modest increases, but makes no more provision for increases than usual exceptions. Also it provides for much needed clerical assistance. Congress recently enacted legislation to preserve "Historic Georgetown," which will further increase the work of the Commission.

The Commission examined the Budget and approved it.

3. LAW TO PROTECT "OLD GEORGETOWN:" The Commission considered the law recently enacted by Congress (Public Law No. 808, 81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950. (Exhibit B)

Mr. Finley expressed the hope that the law would be carried out expeditiously when submissions begin to be received from the Building Inspector's Office. It is a unique law in that it recognizes asthetics as a phase of the Zoning Law; there is none like it in the United States, Its value will ~~be~~ depend on how long it can be kept in operation without having an adverse opinion expressed by the Courts. In the case of the Shipstead-Luce Act, approved May 16, 1930, that has never been tested in the courts over a period of twenty years, and the Commission have been able to show some real results. In that period of time there have been nearly 1400 submissions by the Building Inspector's Office to the Commission of Fine Arts. Similar results can be expected from the "Old Georgetown" law.

Mr. Finley then asked for suggestions regarding architects that could be chosen to serve on a Committee of Architects as mentioned in the Act. This subject was considered at the luncheon at The Octagon, where the Commission were guests of honor of the American Institute of Architects. The following were suggested:

Mr. Walter M. Macomber, Architect of Mount Vernon. Mr. deWeldon presented a letter from Mr. Macomber, in which he set forth his experiences as an architect, which included the position of consulting architect in the restoration work at Williamsburg, Va.

Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, architect of The White House.

Mr. Wm. Dewey Foster, 1636 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. Mr. Foster has specialized in colonial architecture.

These three were appointed by the Commission, Mr. Macomber to serve as Chairman.

The Secretary ascertained from each of them that they would be willing to serve; thereupon Chairman Finley sent to each a letter of appointment. (Exhibit C, C-1 & C-2)

3. LAW TO PROTECT "OLD GEORGETOWN." The Commission considered the law recently enacted by Congress (Public Law No. 808, 81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950. (Exhibit E)

Mr. Finley expressed the hope that the law would be carried out expeditiously when submissions begin to be received from the Building Inspector's Office. It is a unique law in that it recognizes esthetics as a phase of the zoning law; there is none like it in the United States. Its value will depend on how long it can be kept in operation without having an adverse opinion expressed by the Courts. In the case of the Shipstead-Luce Act, approved May 16, 1930, that has never been tested in the courts over a period of twenty years, and the Commission has been able to show some real results. In that period of time there have been nearly 1400 submissions by the Building Inspector's Office to the Commission of Fine Arts. Similar results can be expected from the "Old Georgetown" law.

Mr. Finley then asked for suggestions regarding architects that could be chosen to serve on a Committee of Architects as mentioned in the act. This subject was considered at the luncheon at The Cosmos, where the Commission were guests of honor of the American Institute of Architects. The following were suggested:

Mr. Walter H. Macomber, Architect of Mount Vernon. Mr. Macomber presented a letter from Mr. Macomber, in which he set forth his experiences as an architect, which included the position of consulting architect in the reconstruction work at Williamsburg, Va.

Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, architect of The White House.

Mr. Jim Dowey Foster, 1636 Connecticut Avenue, N. W. Mr. Foster has specialized in colonial architecture.

These three were appointed by the Commission, Mr. Macomber to serve as Chairman.

The Secretary ascertained from each of them that they would be willing to serve; thereupon Chairman Finley sent to each a letter of appointment. (Exhibit F, G, H)

4. CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS IN CONNECTION WITH SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The Secretary stated that since the enactment of the Shipstead-Luce Act on May 16, 1930, there have been nearly 1400 formal submissions by the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, and that during the past four years it has been found possible to act very promptly regarding designs submitted because one of the architect members of the Commission, Prof. F. V. Murphy, is a resident of Washington. Since Prof. Murphy is no longer a member of the Commission, though the head of the firm of Murphy and Locraft, architects, the question has been raised whether or not Prof. Murphy could now serve in the capacity of a consultant.

Mr. Belluschi questioned the advisability of such a procedure, saying "Isn't the Commission abdicating part of its powers? I have great confidence and respect for Mr. Murphy but it is a responsibility of the Commission. If we give it to someone else perhaps we are not doing our duty."

After discussion, the Commission decided that the Secretary should hold the Shipstead-Luce Act submissions for the consideration of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, as also submissions under the "Old Georgetown" act, to be given attention by members of the Commission of Fine Arts the day before a scheduled meeting; the designs could then be finally approved on the day of the meeting of the Commission.

5. DESIGN FOR BENJAMIN FRANKLIN BUILDING: Under date of August 25, 1950, the Commission received a set of drawings from the Building Inspector's Office (Application No. 1359), for an office building at 315 Third Street, N.W., designed by Leon Chatelain, architect of Washington. The Secretary had sent a set of blueprints to Prof. Hudnut, Mr. Belluschi and to Mr. Neild.

Mr. Neild approved the design, before leaving for Europe. Prof. Hudnut deferred expressing an opinion until this meeting of the Commission.

4. CONSULTING ARCHITECT TO THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS IN CONNECTION WITH SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT SUBMISSIONS: The Secretary stated that since the enactment of the Shipstead-Luce Act on May 16, 1930, there have been nearly 1400 formal submissions by the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, and that during the past four years it has been found possible to act very promptly regarding designs submitted because one of the architect members of the Commission, Prof. F. V. Murphy, is a resident of Washington. Since Prof. Murphy is no longer a member of the Commission, though the head of the firm of Murphy and Locraft, Architects, the question has been raised whether or not Prof. Murphy could not serve in the capacity of a consultant.

Mr. Bellinger questioned the advisability of such a procedure, saying "Isn't the Commission abdicating part of its powers? I have great confidence and respect for Mr. Murphy but it is a responsibility of the Commission. If we give it to someone else perhaps we are not doing our duty."

After discussion, the Commission decided that the recommendations of the members of the Commission of Fine Arts, as also submissions under the "Old Georgetown" act, to be given attention by members of the Commission of Fine Arts the day before a scheduled meeting; the designs could then be finally approved on the day of the meeting of the Commission.

5. DESIGN FOR RESIDENCE FOR MARION DUNCAN: Under date of August 18, 1930, the Commission received a set of drawings from the Building Inspector's Office (Application No. 1959), for an office building at 2122 Kalorama Street, designed by Leon Dietzler, architect of Washington. The Secretary had sent a set of blueprints to Prof. Hunnewell, Mr. Bellinger and Mr. Reid.

Mr. Reid approved the design, before leaving for Europe. Prof. Hunnewell deferred expressing an opinion until this meeting of the Commission.

Mr. Belluschi submitted a report, criticizing the design as follows:

"It appears unfortunate to me that the architect should have relied for his exterior embellishment on motifs which, in my opinion, are arbitrary and unconvincing; therefore, inevitably subject to being outmoded. The dark spandrels, attempting to create an unnecessary vertical movement in what in effect is a simple low building; the corner windows, introducing horizontal movement which does not compose with the vertical; an entrance arbitrarily superimposed and out-of-scale---they all seem to me unfortunate attempts to put on 'the architecture' just like the old classical orders were indiscriminately hung on business buildings, the only difference being that the orders had a certain claim to historical continuity and contributed greatly to the general consistency of the environment. They also possessed charm and gentility.

"I strongly believe that, unless we are organically sound in our thinking, we cannot advance any claim of architectural progress; for this reason, I for one, disapprove the design of the office building as submitted."

Chairman Finley stated that the promoters of the project had asked him if action on the design could be expedited, so as to make it possible to make the most of the good weather of the season; and that, therefore, he had asked the architect to change the design to meet Mr. Belluschi's objections; also that he had written to the Director of Inspection asking him to allow the promoters an excavation permit and one to begin on the foundations, since the architect had agreed to make such changes in the foundation plans as might become necessary as the result of the action taken by the Commission with regard to the design for the superstructure (Exhibit D)

Mr. Chatelain appeared before the Commission to explain his design. He said:

"The photostat which we sent out about a month ago was not a true perspective of the building as proposed. I did not realize it when I sent it to Dr. Caemmerer. The building should have looked like this (indicating on a new drawing). The photograph you were given had originally a little different arrangement of windows on the corner. Also the doorway was not tall and thin.

"We then made a re-study of it without these corner windows. The part that bothers me somewhat is the corner at Indiana Avenue and Third Street, which is an acute angle. We want to avoid putting a window in a narrow end. It would be a rather bad room to be rented. The owners are anxious to retain a corner, properly designed, since it is a commercial building, and the rental of these corner suites becomes an item of consideration. Also it lightens up the sharp angle at Indiana Avenue."

Mr. Bellmont submitted a report, criticizing the design as follows:

"It appears unfortunate to me that the architect should have relied for his exterior embellishment on motifs which, in my opinion, are arbitrary and inconvenient; therefore, inevitably subject to being outmoded. The dark spandrels, attempting to create an unnecessary vertical movement in what is effect is a simple low building; the corner windows, introducing horizontal movement which does not comply with the vertical, an entirely arbitrarily superimposed and out-of-scale--they all seem to be unfortunate attempts to put on 'the architecture' just like the old classical orders were indiscriminately hung on modern buildings, the only difference being that the orders had a certain claim to historical consistency and contributed greatly to the general consistency of the environment. They also possessed charm and gentility.

"I strongly believe that, whatever we, as aesthetically sound in our thinking, we cannot advance any claim of architectural progress; for this reason, I for one, disapprove the design of the office building as submitted."

Chairman Finley stated that the promoters of the project had asked him if action on the design could be expedited, so as to make it possible to make the most of the good weather of the season; and that, therefore, he had asked the architect to change the design to meet Mr. Bellmont's objections; also that he had written to the Director of Inspection asking him to allow the promoters an excavation permit and cope on angle on the 3 underlots, since the architect had agreed to make such changes in the foundation plans as might become necessary as the result of the action taken by the Commission with regard to the design for the superstructure (Exhibit 3).

Mr. Chatelain appeared before the Commission to explain the design. He said:

"The protocsts which we sent out about a month ago was not in true perspective of the building as proposed. I did not realize it when I sent it to Dr. Bessemer. The building should have looked like this (indicating on a new drawing). The photographs you were given had originally a little different arrangement of windows on the corner. Also the doorway was not tall and thin.

"We then made a re-study of it without these corner windows. The part that bothers me somewhat is the corner on Indiana Avenue and Ohio Street, which is an acute angle. We want to avoid putting a window in a narrow end. It would be a rather bad room to be behind. The owners are anxious to retain a corner, properly designed, since it is a commercial building, and the rental of these corner suites becomes an item of consideration. Also it lightens up the sharp angle at Indiana Avenue."

Mr. Chatelain submitted two sketches for treatment of the corner

Mr. Hudnut said, "I think it is a great improvement on the corner. I see the point of renting those sections. Could you put a treatment of that kind on this other corner, too?

Mr. Chatelain replied, "Yes, I think that could be done. We would have a little trouble doing it on the back corner, because we do not own those two properties adjoining. It would throw us out on our spacing, but we could re-space those (indicating)."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I am expressing rather hurried judgments, but I think that is better. I think that is a nice way of treating a corner."

Mr. Belluschi asked, "Do you not have to re-space your windows somewhat?"

Mr. Chatelain replied, "No, on this one we have just put the window in this corner. Actually what happens here is that this is the same spacing. Unfortunately I am losing my men to the Draft Board. I have had three men make these pictures in the last month, so they do not all quite look alike in the drafting. If you will notice, we have just put masonry on the corner and retained that same spacing.

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "What I mean is this: If you have this spacing here, if this wasn't here it would come up to the corner and would be much wider

Mr. Chatelain: The one recommended by the Chairman is the same as the one with square corners.

Mr. Hudnut: This design with the double windows in the corners has a better relation.

Mr. Chatelain: It would appear to be a little forced there just to cut off the corners.

Mr. Belluschi: I quite agree it would be forced. You would not see it as you visualize it in the plan.

Mr. Belluschi then asked about the working drawings, and Mr. Chatelain stated that they have been prepared. As a matter of fact they are going to begin excavations Monday." At this particular time everyone is trying to get buildings built before something holds them up.

Thereupon Mr. Belluschi complained about the submission of plans to the Commission of Fine Arts at such a late date, when an examination of the plans by the Commission would be apt to be purely perfunctory, and resulting in constructive criticism costly to the architect and unfair to him.

Mr. Hudnut said, "I think it is a great improvement on the corner. I see the point of rounding those sections. Could you put a treatment of that kind on this other corner, too?

Mr. Chatelain replied, "Yes, I think that could be done. We would have a little trouble doing it on the back corner, because we do not own those two properties adjoining. It would throw us out on our spacing, but we could re-space those (indicating)."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I am expressing rather hurried judgments, but I think that is better. I think that is a nice way of treating a corner."

Mr. Bellmont asked, "Do you not have to re-space your windows somewhat?"

Mr. Chatelain replied, "No, on this one we have just put the window in this corner. Actually what happens here is that this is the same spacing. Unfortunately I am losing my men to the Draft Board. I have had three men make these pictures in the last month, so they do not all quite look alike in the drafting. If you will notice, we have just put masonry on the corner and retained that same spacing.

Mr. Bellmont remarked, "What I mean is this: If you have this spacing here, if this wasn't here it would come up to the corner and would be much wider

Mr. Chatelain: The one recommended by the Chairman is the same as the one with square corners.

Mr. Hudnut: This design with the double windows in the corners has a better relation.

Mr. Chatelain: It would appear to be a little forced there just to cut off the corners.

Mr. Bellmont: I quite agree it would be forced. You would not see it as you visualize it in the plan.

Mr. Bellmont then asked about the working drawings, and Mr. Chatelain stated that they have been prepared. As a matter of fact they are going to begin excavations Monday." At this particular time everyone is trying to get buildings built before something holds them up.

Thereupon Mr. Bellmont complained about the submission of plans to the Commission of Fine Arts at such a late date, when an examination of the plans by the Commission would be apt to be purely perfunctory, and resulting in constructive criticism costly to the architect and unfair to him.

Mr. Belluschi urged that architects be asked to submit their sketches in their earliest stages, so that the Commission may pass on the exterior appearance of a proposed building, without working drawings. The Commission concurred in this, and it is to be given publicity.

In further criticism of the design, Mr. Belluschi said, "There are two comments I want to make. One is the question of philosophy of design. It seems there is still the question of stone masonry design on a steel building. There is nothing we can do about that.

"Secondly, I think the entrance is out of scale and forced because it takes in the first floor and second floor windows as a part of the entrance."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I think you can get away from the monumental treatment in the masonry. Are the masonry joints carried through vertically?"

Mr. Chatelain replied, "They are carried through horizontally." Mr. Hudnut said, "That helps a lot."

Mr. Belluschi asked about the material, and Mr. Chatelain replied "Aluminum. As to the entrance, it is granite."

Mr. Hudnut asked for the reason for having a two-story entrance.

Mr. Chatelain replied, "We feel as though it gives more importance to the entrance to the offices over the store fronts. There are side entrances to the stores on the side and another one at the corner and it emphasizes the entrance to the building, or the entrance to the upper stories of the building."

Mr. Peets remarked, "I have a feeling that what we have here is a secular wall feature of a base of an outdoor space and that this strong entrance that the gentlemen have been mentioning tends to destroy that as a wall and to emphasize the identity of the building itself. Possibly there is a symmetrical arrangement inside. Do you see what I mean?"

Mr. Hudnut said, "I quite agree. I also agree with the owners' desire to advertise it properly."

Mr. Sullivan urged that architects be zones in [illegible] are provided in their earliest stages, so that the Commission may pass on the entrance [illegible] of a proposed building, without wasting drawings. The Commission [illegible] is to be given publicity.

In further [illegible] Mr. Sullivan said, "There are two comments I want [illegible] revision of philosophy of design. It seems there is still the question of where masonry design on a steel building. There is nothing we can do about that.

[illegible] the entrance is out of scale and forces because it makes in the lift [illegible] and secure floor windows is a part of the entrance."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I think you can get away from the [illegible] treatment in the [illegible]

Mr. Chatelain [illegible]

Hudnut said, "That helps a lot."

Mr. Sullivan [illegible] about the [illegible], and [illegible] requires [illegible] as to the entrance, it is [illegible]."

Mr. Hudnut asked for the reason for having a two-story entrance.

Mr. Chatelain replied, "We feel as though it gives more importance to the entrance to the [illegible] over the stores. There [illegible] made entrances in the stores on the side [illegible] and entrance to the building, or the entrance [illegible]

[illegible] "I have a feeling that what we have here is a [illegible] wall feature of a [illegible] or outdoor space and then this strong entrance from the gentlemen have been mentioning tends to destroy that as a wall and [illegible] emphasis [illegible] I. Possibly there is a [illegible] on see what I mean."

[illegible] quite agree. I also agree with the general desire to advertise it properly."

In conclusion, Mr. Belluschi said, I have a strong feeling that it would be unfair to make great changes in this design. I would recommend it be approved with the changes mentioned by Professor Kennedy for the north corner. I would perhaps recommend that the entrance be restudied. However, I would like to make a very strong point, in the future architects should submit their projects in sketch stages and not in the working drawing stages."

Mr. Chatelain said he would embody the changes suggested by the Commission and send prints of the final design to the Commission for approval.

6. APARTMENT BUILDING AT 25th and E Streets, N. W.: The Secretary stated that in response to a request of the Commission that the National Capital Park and Planning Commission send a report to the Commission of Fine Arts, expressing their views on the subject of erecting an apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N. W., the following Memorandum was received from Mr. John Nolen, Director of Planning:

August 10, 1950

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
Commission of Fine Arts.

The plans of the Kass Realty Company for constructing an apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N. W., which you transmitted with your memorandum of July 25, were presented to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission at its meeting on August 3.

As the properties in question are already authorized for acquisition and lie in close proximity to land in process of acquisition for further development of the Northwest rectangle, the Commission is naturally opposed to any private development which would affect this plan adversely and which would involve any substantial additional expense for later acquisition.

The Commission has therefore written Public Buildings Service urging acquisition of the lots on which the apartment building is proposed to be located, either with current funds if possible, or attempt to secure funds for this and other emergency situations.

I am returning herewith the plans and rendering which you submitted with your memorandum.

John Nolen, Jr.,
Director of Planning."

A copy of the letter mentioned, which was sent to Commissioner Reynolds of the Public Buildings Service, is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit 1).

The exact location of the proposed building was noted, namely on the west side of Square 33, lots 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. It is to be a six-story, 189 unit, building.

Mr. Belluschi said he concurred "very much" in the recommendation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and in this the Commission concurred.

Mr. Peets said he visited the site to familiarize himself with the locality. It is near a brewery, with a parking lot nearby. There is then a steep hill down and a kind of jungle wilderness in there." The locality is in slum condition.

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "Are we supposed to pass just on that? It seems to me the Commission can do more than that. I think I for one would pass the design but I would be very much against a building of this kind occupying ground that would possibly be used otherwise.

The secretary called attention to the fact that this site is adjacent to a "restricted area," with numerous temporary war buildings nearby in which National Defense work is being carried on. Also, he said, the assessed value of the lots in question is about $25,000 and that, since, as he had heard from the Public Buildings Administration that no funds are available to buy the lots, a letter should be written to the President of the United States directing the Administrator of General Services (of which P.B.A. is a part) to acquire them, in view of the small amount involved.

The Commission felt that such letter should be written by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission since they have authority to buy land for Government use, but should have the concurrent signature also of the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Nolen was notified to that effect and the letter is being prepared, accordingly. Further action regarding the design was therefore held in abeyance until the meeting of the Commission on November 21st.

The exact location of the proposed building was noted, namely on the west side of Square 32, Lots 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11. It is to be a six-story, 125 unit, building.

Mr. Bellmont said he concurred "very much" in the recommendation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and in this the Commission

Mr. Peets said he visited the site to familiarize himself with the locality. It is near a brewery, with a parking lot nearby. There is then a strong hill down and a kind of jungle wilderness in there." The locality is in slum

Mr. Bellmont remarked, "Are we supposed to pass just on that? It seems to me the Commission can do more than that. I think I for one would pass the design but I would be very much against a building of this kind occupying ground that would possibly be used otherwise.

The secretary called attention to the fact that this site is adjacent to a "restricted area," with numerous temporary war buildings nearby in w National Defense work is being carried on. Also, he said, the assessed value of the lots in question is about $25,000 and that, since, as he had heard from the Public Buildings Administration that no funds are available to buy the lots, a letter should be written to the President of the United States directing the Administrator of General Services (of which N.P.C. is a part) to ac in view of the small amount involved.

The Commission felt that such letter should be written by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission since they have authority to buy land for Government use, but should have the concurrence signature also of the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts. Mr. Nolen was notified to that effect and the letter is being prepared, accordingly. Further action regarding the design was therefore held in abeyance until the meeting of the Commission on November 21st.

7. COMMERCIAL BUILDING AT 21st Street and VIRGINIA AVENUE, N. W.: The Commission considered a revised design for a commercial building at this location, submitted by the Kass Realty Company. Prof. Hudnut and Mr. Belluschi gave the design particular attention, and criticized it as being poor in design. Prof. Hudnut felt it should be disapproved. Mr. Belluschi thought that effort should be made to give them further advice.

Mr. Finley called attention to and read the following letter received from the Kass Realty Company on the subject:

Kass Realty Company, Inc.
4461 Connecticut Ave., N. W.
Washington, D.C., Sept.6,1950

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

We acknowledge your letter of July 25, 1950, rejecting the design for a commercial building which we proposed to erect at Twenty-first Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest.

On several occasions plans have been sent to you for your consideration and, in each instance, they have been disapproved for the reason that the design 'lacks dignity.' In addition, we have discussed this with members of the Commission to obtain from them just what design would be acceptable. The replies, in each case, have been evasive and no firm suggestion has been offered.

We have determined to proceed with the construction of this building and we hope to be able to do so with your approval. We are willing to comply with any reasonable request which you may set forth, so far as the design of the building is concerned. However, we have made all of the designs which we propose to make, in the absence of information from you as to what will be acceptable from your standpoint. If you wish to provide us with any recommendations we shall be very glad to consider them and, if they are practical and reasonable, we will incorporate them into our plans.

In the event you are unwilling to provide us with a design, or definite idea as to what you require, then we propose to submit the plans to the District Building Authorities with a request that a building permit be issued and if it is refused, by reason of your disapproval of the design, then we propose to submit the matter to the proper court for their interpretation of our legal rights in the matter.

Very truly yours,
KASS REALTY COMPANY, INC.,
Signed
Garfield I. Kass, President

Mr. Finley said he felt rather provoked to receive such a letter, since the Commission helped them nearly a year ago with a design, but the company

7. COMMERCIAL BUILDING at 21st Street and VERMONT AVENUE [illegible]. The Commission considered a revised design for a commercial building at this location, submitted by the Kass Realty Company. Prof. Hubbut and Mr. Pellbaum gave the design particular attention, and criticized it as being poor in design. Prof. Hubbut felt it should be disapproved. Mr. Pellbaum thought that effort should be made to give them further advice.

Mr. Finley called attention to and read the following letter received from the Kass Realty Company on the subject:

[illegible]

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
[illegible]
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

We acknowledge your letter of July 25, 1930, rejecting the design for a commercial building which we proposed to erect at Twenty-Ninth Street and [illegible].

[illegible]

and, in each instance, they have been disapproved for the reason that the design 'lacks dignity.' In addition, we have discussed this with members of the Commission to obtain from them just what a design would be acceptable. The replies, in each case, have been evasive and no firm suggestion has been offered.

We have determined to proceed with the construction of this building and we hope to be able to do so with your approval. We are willing to comply with any [illegible] in connection. However, we have made all of the designs [illegible] standpoint. If you wish to provide us with any recommendations we shall be very glad to consider them and, if they are practical and reasonable, we will incorporate them into our plans.

In the event you are unwilling to provide us with a design, or definite idea as to what you require, then we propose to submit the plans to the Building Building Authorities with a request that a building permit be issued and if it is refused, by reason of your disapproval of the design, then we propose to submit the matter to the proper court for their interpretation of our legal rights in the matter.

Very truly yours,

[illegible]

Mr. Finley said he felt rather provoked to receive such a letter, since the Commission helped them nearly a year ago with a design, but the company

has done nothing about the project until now. At that time last year Prof. Murphy conferred with an architect named Hogan in the employ of the company about the design but Mr. Hogan is now no longer with the company.

Mr. Finley said he considered the letter from Mr. Kass in the nature of a challenge, and therefore replied to him (Exhibit F) to the effect that the Commission would be willing to consider their design further after consultation with Professor Murphy; but otherwise they could do as they thought best.

However, Mr. Finley said, they sent one of their architects, Mr. G. S. Brock, to see Mr. Murphy, and the perspective now before the Commission is the result. They made no change in the blueprints. The chimney to which the Commission objected at the July meeting is at the northeast corner of the building and scarcely visible from Virginia Avenue.

Criticizing the design, Mr. Belluschi said, "I think a two-story building is a difficult to design. I do not think we could criticize its lack of distinction because it is a very vague point to make, but I would say that by hiding the columns behind windows that open, it creates a feeling of sham to which the Commission objects. Arbitrarily, they have introduced a solid wall at the ends [per Belluschi letter of 6 Nov. 1950] for no obvious reasons, other than probably to give a little rigidity. They have the columns right behind glass, hidden, which gives a strong feeling of being just an applied facade. . . I think it is ugly because it is a fake and it is a fake because the structure has been disregarded completely and it has some kind of skin on it which could never pass as beauty."

Mr. Peets was of the opinion that the design should also be considered from the standpoint of planning, saying: "Planners unfortunately become calloused to architectural details. I mean thinking about the general effect of it and all, the buildings are done by different architects and there are a lot of different cases."

has done nothing about the project until now. I think it has been very, [illegible] happy concerned with an architect's need to [illegible] in the employ of the commission about the design but he. [illegible] is now no longer with the commission.

Mr. Finley said he considered the Lincoln Park [illegible] of a challenge, and there was reason to hope, judging by the [illegible] that the Commission would be willing to [illegible] in their design problem. [illegible] consultation with Professor Wright and [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

However, Mr. Finley said, [illegible] Schulze, architect. [illegible] Brook, [illegible] see Mr. Murphy, one [illegible] the Commission [illegible] the result. They have [illegible] the [illegible]. The [illegible] the Commission objected at the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

Criticizing the design, Mr. Pellicard said, [illegible] building is a difficult design. [illegible] do not think we could [illegible] lack of individuality because it is a very [illegible] point to [illegible] say that by hiding the columns behind windows that [illegible] [illegible] ing of [illegible] to which the Commission [illegible] [illegible] a solid wall for no obvious reasons, other than possibly to give [illegible] little rigidity. They have the columns [illegible] behind glass, [illegible] gives a strong feeling of being just an applied facade. [illegible] [illegible] because it is a [illegible] and [illegible] a [illegible] because the structure [illegible] disassociated completely and it has some kind of [illegible] [illegible].

Mr. Fiske was of the opinion that the design should also be [illegible] from the abundant of planning, saying: "[illegible] unfortunately [illegible] confined to architectural [illegible]. I mean something that [illegible] effect of it and all, the buildings are done by [illegible] [illegible] and

"I think it is the specific exterior artistry in the building that we are supposed to protect. I therefore feel your suggested criticism (speaking to Mr. Belluschi) is too specifically local and architectural."

Mr. Belluschi took some exception to that viewpoint, saying, "I would like to hear more about that because that rather disturbs my thought. You said sound planning. I thought it was the reverse, that we were not concerned with any sound planning but with the appropriateness of the building, in our limited judgment."

Mr. Peets replied, "I would say the top planning factor comes in the law, in the limitations of the area (as specified in the Shipstead-Luce Act, approved May 16, 1930). It is not that we are asked to see that all the buildings in Washington are well-designed buildings but only the appearance of certain places is protected."

Mr. Belluschi remarked, "I do not understand it that way, I am sorry."

Thereupon the actual wording of the Shipstead-Luce Act was considered briefly and discussed (ExhibitG).

Chairman Finley remarked that he considered it quite a good record to the credit of this Commission that the law has been in operation for twenty years and has never been tested in the courts.

Thereupon, Mr. Finley suggested that the architects of the Kass Realty Company be asked to discuss their design with the Commission at 4 o'clock this afternoon. Arrangements were made accordingly, and at about 4:30 p.m. Mr. G. S. Brock and Mr. Irving D. Berger, architects for the Kass Realty appeared before the Commission for a discussion as to their design. They were informed of several criticisms of the Commission. As to height of the chimney Mr. Brock said that is unavoidable, since it must comply with the D. C. Code.

Mr. Belluschi urged that they move a column up to the corner and cover

"I think it is the specific exterior architecture in the building that we are supposed to protect. I therefore feel your suggested criticism (speaking to Mr. Bellusch) is too specifically local and architectural."

Mr. Bellusch took some exception to this viewpoint, saying, "I would like to hear more about this because that relates disturbs my thought. You said sound planning. I thought it was the reverse, that we were not concerned with any sound planning but with the appropriateness of the building, in our limited judgment."

Mr. Peets replied, "I would say the top planning factor comes in the law, in the limitations of the area (as specified in the ordinance-that act, approved May 16, 1930). It is not that we are asked to see that all the buildings in Washington are well-designed buildings but only the appearance of certain places is protected."

Mr. Bellusch remarked, "I do not understand it that way, I am sorry."

Thereupon the actual wording of the ordinance [illegible] briefly and discussed (Exhibit 6).

Chairman Finley remarked that it be considered it quite a good record to the credit of this Commission that the law has been in operation for twenty years and has never been tested in the courts.

Thereupon, Mr. Finley suggested that the architects of the case nearby Company be asked to discuss their design with the Commission at a related this afternoon. Arrangements were made accordingly, and at about 4:30 p.m. Mr. G. S. Brook and Mr. Irving D. Berger, architects for the [illegible] appeared before the Commission for a discussion as to their [illegible] were informed of several criticisms of the Commission. As to height of the chimney Mr. Brook said that is unavoidable, since it must comply with the [illegible].

Mr. Bellusch urged that they move a column up to the corner and cover

it with limestone at the second and third floors. That the windows be respaced, and that a pier effect be given to the first floor facade with limestone so as to hide a column just back of the glass window.

The architects of the Kass Realty Company said they had no objection to these changes and that they would embody them in the design.

8. HEADQUARTERS BUILDING FOR THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS: Mr. John W. Root, accompanied by his assistant Mr. D. W. Carlson, of the firm of Holabird and Root, of Chicago, appeared before the Commission with the design for this building. Attention was called to the fact that the architects who appeared in behalf of this firm at the July meeting of the Commission had been requested to give further study to the facade fronting on Union Station Plaza and the Capitol Grounds, adjacent to Louisiana Avenue. It was noted, however, that the firm had made no changes in the design for the reason, as Mr. Root explained, his clients the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, wanted the building to be built as Mr. Root had designed it. Mr. Root said:

"This is an unusual problem at best. I think it marks something of an innovation, in that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters -- and I think there are chauffers and others, who decided to build a central headquarters here in Washington. They bought the site with which you are familiar adjacent to the Capitol Grounds. They have quite a problem for their central headquarters in that the Brotherhood is made up of a series of other unions -- I think some ten smaller unions that also have their headquarters in Washington. They have to provide, here, certain quarters for each one of those separate unions, as well as for the national group. They are also very anxious to give each one of those executive officers of the ten separate unions about equal status as far as the quality and character of their headquarters are concerned. They felt it was necessary to place the quarters on Louisiana Avenue facing the Capitol.

"In addition to that they required a large meeting room for 750 people. That auditorium naturally is on the first floor and exacts a large foyer, or entrance. That foyer, preferably, should have in front of it a canopy or marques of some sort.

"The first floor is largely devoted to the meeting room and the services. The upper floors contain some conference rooms and meeting rooms for the executives and committees of the various branches.

"There are Frank Tobin and his associates, but we deal with Frank Tobin,

lit with lanterns on the second and third floors. That the windows be reopened, and that a later effort be given to the third floor facade with lanterns so as to hide a column just back of the grass at top.

The architects of the Pass Realty Company said they had ... objection to these changes and that they would carry them in the ...

Mr. John W. E. Root, accompanied by his associates ... Dutton, of the firm of Holabird and Root, of Chicago, appeared before the Commission with the design for this building. Attention was called to the fact that the committees who appeared in behalf of this item at the July meeting of the Commission had been requested to give further study to the frieze facing on Main Plaza and the ... level towards adjacent to Lafayette Avenue. It was noted, however, that the firm had made no change in the frieze.

Root explained, his client is the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the building to be built as ... and designed ...

"This is an unusual problem at best. I think it marks something of an innovation, in that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters — ... I think there are committees and others, who decided to build a central headquarters here in Washington. Now begin to take stock which you familiar objects to the Central Committee. They have quite a ... their central headquarters in that sort of building in ... or other unions — I think some ten unions that ... headquarters in Washington. They have to provide, more, ... for each one of these separate unions, as well as for the ... They are also very anxious to ... each one of ... of the ten separate unions about equal ... character of their headquarters are ... to place the quarters on Lafayette Avenue facing the Capitol.

"In addition to that they wanted a large meeting room for 700 people. That auditorium naturally is on the first floor ... floor, or entrance. That floor, ... would have ...

"The first floor is largely devoted to the meeting room ... service. The upper floors contain some conference rooms ... for the executives and committees of the various boards.

"There are Frank Kohn and his associates ...

who is a very unusual personality and a very interesting man, a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a very stimulating type. In any event, Mr. Tobin has told us to give some prominence to the outlook over the Capitol Grounds as far as the executive offices are concerned. Also he is very anxious to voice the feeling of his associates to have a great deal of glass. He wants slight columns and doesn't want them to be in the way.

"We therefore tried, within the bounds of that part of the program, to develop something that was not necessarily classical, but somewhat formal in its arrangement and also give the features desired. Further, he did say he wanted a structure built of the best materials and he had a preference for marble. The building is a pretty substantial job all the way through. It will be quite a monument to the union. That about is the program. I understand you saw the design at your meeting recently. Two of your members here today didn't see it, so I think it might be well to point out the site."

Mr. Caelson explained the location, at Louisiana Avenue and North Capitol Street fronting on Union Station Plaza and the Capitol Grounds. There is an elaborate scheme for parking and planting around the building. It would have a proper setting.

Mr. Carlson pointed out Mr. Tobin's office and those of his assistants. The building will be air conditioned. They will have two levels of garage space.

Continuing, Mr. Root said, "We felt there would have to be some dominant motive for the whole building. We took the excuse of the large windows for the separate offices to do that. Then in addition to that we did not need to carry it down to the ground because the foyer was plenty big enough as it was and we did not need the canopy; we were not able to find a successful solution to a canopy at the front of the building."

Mr. Carlson said, "At the very outset they would have liked to have had glass all over but in Washington the heat load is so terrific on the air conditioning, so they allowed for this unit. It is double glass and heat resisting.

Mr. Belluschi said, "I think that statement is very interesting. That was the ground of our original criticism. I know just what you are up against and I understand the feature. There are times when we want to use a lot of glass, but I argue against it. Sometimes I lose out."

Mr. Hudnut said, "You have the columns holding up glass. You don't get the effect of a canopy at all. You have very powerful columns holding up a thin sheet of glass. The truth is that they are holding up a canopy. (Mr. Root interposed by saying, "Well they are holding up a structure.") There is no structure in the glass. It is just a glass wall. You have offices back of the glass. But the glass wall expresses a great room."

Mr. Finley asked about the depth of the "projection" and Mr. Root replied, "Eight feet."

Consideration was then given to widening this "projection" or "applique" out to the corners of the facade, or heightening it to the top, so that this architectural feature does not look like something framed.

who is a very unusual personality and a very interesting man, a member of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and a very stimulating type. In any event, Mr. Todd has told us to give some consideration to the opinion over the Capitol Grounds so far as the executive of this are concerned. Also he is very anxious to voice the feeling of his associates to have a great deal of glass. He wants slight columns and doesn't want them to be [illegible]

"We therefore tried, within the bounds of that part of the program develop something that was not necessarily classical, but somewhat the arrangement and also give the impression desired. Further, he did want a structure built of the best materials and be but a permanent marble. The building is a rotary auditorium, so all the way through. It will be quite a moment to see which. Then about to the program. I understand you are the design at your meeting yesterday. The of your members today didn't see it, so I think it might be well to point out the [illegible]."

Mr. Gaelson explained the location, on Independence Avenue and about fronting on Union Station Plaza and the Capitol [illegible]. elaborate scheme for parking and also [illegible] the building. a proper setting.

Mr. Gaelson pointed out Mr. Todd's offices are [illegible] the building will be air conditioned. They will have the space.

Continuing, Mr. Hood said, "We felt there would have [illegible] motive for the whole building. We took the process of [illegible] the separate offices to do that. Then in addition to that we did [illegible] carry it down to the ground because the [illegible] and we did not need the canopy; we were not able to find a successful solution to a canopy at the front of the building."

[illegible] glass all over but in Washington the heat load is so terrible [illegible] conditioning, so they allowed for this unit. It is double glass [illegible]

Mr. Ballinger said, "I think that statement is very interesting. That was the ground of our original criticism. I know [illegible] you are up against and I understand the feature. There are times when we want to use a lot of glass, but I argue against it. Sometimes I lose out."

Mr. Hudnut said, "You have the column holding up glass. You don't get the effect of a canopy at all. You have very powerful columns holding up a thin sheet of glass. The trouble is that they are trying to a canopy." (Mr. Hood interposed by saying, "Well they are holding up a structure.") There is no structure in the glass. It is just a glass wall. You have offices back of the glass. But the glass wall expresses a great room."

Mr. Finley asked about the depth of the "projections and [illegible]

Consideration was then given to widening this "projection" or "[illegible]" out to the corners of the facade, or heightening it to the top, so that it architectural feature does not look like something framed.

Mr. Root commented further by saying, "The offices are not big enough to allow putting the projection back. Then again if you brought the whole motive out to the front of the building on the first floor, it becomes a kind of structure that is not in good proportion. We tried to think of the fact that the whole building is horizontal in shape and tried to emphasize the fact that it is horizontal by accentuating the horizontal motive. That is true of the two-story window just as well. Now, in order to further emphasize that, we have shown glass pretty much on the first floor. In the canopy or the projection or whatever you want to call it, that is an asset to the space. It is not needed on the first floor. It seemed to me that there was a functional suggestion that ought to permit us to find something a little unusual, you see."

Mr. Hudnut remarked, "I agree with that. I like the canopy very much. I have no objection to that. But I do not like the framing in of the glass. It is supported down on the columns, free of the structure."

Mr. Root replied, "From the point of view of supporting it, it would be a very difficult structural job. The canopy would go down all the way. They wanted a special type of office. They were willing to pay for the heat load. They wanted us to give them glass. It seems there should be solution for that."

Mr. Hudnut suggested, "Either carry the glass up to the roof or carry it out to the corners. Either way you would get away from the appearance of having something laid against the side of the building."

Mr. Root agreed that those are possibilities. "But we are a little up against it. We were told to get it out for bids. Any change is a very serious thing and will cause some delay."

Mr. Belluschi pointed out that the building will be there for the next 300 or 500 years and that some effort should be made to meet the objections of the Commission. "If we make this criticism, it is the criticism of a great many people in the same way. If there is some way to solve it, it ought to be done."

Mr. Hudnut said, "I think the Commission has agreed that the canopy treatment is excellent and that we like the larger windows, and that the treatment of the largest window is the thing we don't like, the framing of it. If there could be a different treatment of that window, that would be the solution."

Mr. Root commented further by saying, "The offices are not big enough to allow putting the projection back. Then again if you brought the whole motive out to the front of the building on the first floor, it becomes a kind of structure that is not in good proportion. We tried to think of the fact that the whole building is horizontal in shape and tries, to emphasize the fact that it is horizontal by accentuating the horizontal motive. That is true of the two-story window just as well. Now, in order to further emphasize that, we have brought glass pretty much on the first floor. canopy or the projection or whatever you want to call it, then is to the space. It is not needed on the first floor. It seemed to there was a functional suggestion that brought to provide us to find a little unusual, you see."

Mr. Hubbut remarked, "I agree with that. I like the canopy very much. I have no objection to that. But I do not like the framing in of the glass. It is supported down on the columns, face of the structure."

Mr. Root replied, "From the point of view of supporting it, it would be a very difficult structural job. The canopy would go down all the way. They wanted a special type of office. They were willing to p They wanted us to give them glass. It seems there should be exhibition for that."

Mr. Hubbut suggested, "Rather carry the glass up to the roof or carry it out to the corners. Rather way you could get away from the appearance having something laid against the side of the building."

Mr. Root agreed that these are possibilities. "Let me see a little up against it. We were told to get it out for this. Any change is a very serious thing and will cause some delay."

Mr. Ballinsoit pointed out that the 200 or 300 years and that some effort should be made to meet the objections of the Commission. "If we make this criticism, it is the criticism of a great many people in the same way. If there is some way to solve it ought to be done."

Mr. Hubbut said, "I think the Commission has agreed that the canopy treatment is excellent and that we like the larger windows, and that the treatment of the largest window is the thing we don't like, the framing of it. If there could be a different treatment of that window, that would be

Various suggestions were then made, including a suggestion to extend the projection so as to bring it into relationship with the side walls.

Chairman Finley suggested that Mr. Root and Mr. Carlson give some further study to the problem and meet with the Commission at four o'clock in the afternoon for a further consideration of it.

At four o'clock Mr. Root and Mr. Carlson returned with a sketch they made during the afternoon, showing this "projection" in much better relation with the building. The Commission felt satisfied with the treatment proposed and the architects agreed to embody it in the final drawing.

9. DESIGN FOR DENTAL SCHOOL, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: The Acting Supervising Architect, Mr. Hunter, of the Public Buildings Administration, submitted a design for a Dental School building, at Howard University; design by the architect of the University, Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson. Mr. Robinson said it is to be built next to the Medical School. It was designed in the contemporary style of architecture because new buildings are in that style.

Mr. Robinson explained the design. He said, "This building is made up primarily of clinics. The major area of the floor area in the building is for clinics. The clinics are around the outside walls with the exception of the front. In the front is a reception room and such as are related to it. One of the important requirements of the solution was to be able to expand the building vertically to accommodate two floors. This is the contract status with a three-story requirement. Here is the future status with a five-story requirement. With those rather broad generalities, I think that is the building. The construction is fireproof. It is designed with a reinforced concrete frame with brick enclosing walls. The major part of the exterior facade is in brick with a trimming in limestone. There are these large windows and a canopy on the porch."

"The character of both the plan and the appearance of the building is to reflect two fundamental types of building use. The general public goes in here for distribution to the clinics. The students go in here and through a court to their classroom and their usual departments so that you have a building that appeals primarily at this point to the public use and in terms of students to have access from this side. I think that is just about the general description of the building's concept."

Chairman Finley asked if there were any questions. There being none, on motion of Mr. Belluschi, seconded by Mr. deWeldon, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit H).

Various suggestions were then made, including a suggestion to extend the projection so as to bring it into relationship with the side walls.

Chairman Finley suggested that Mr. Hoss and Mr. Gerlson give some further study to the problem and meet with the Commission at four o'clock in the afternoon for a further consideration of it.

At four o'clock P. Hoss and Mr. Gerlson returned with a sketch they made during the afternoon, showing this "projection" in much better relation with the building. The Commission felt satisfied with the treatment proposed and the architects agreed to embody it in the final drawing.

9. DESIGN FOR DENTAL SCHOOL, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: The Acting supervising Architect, Mr. Hunter, of the Public Buildings Administration, submitted design for a Dental School building, as Howard University's design to be architect of the University, Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson. Mr. Robinson said it is to be built next to the Medical School. It was designed in the contemporary style of architecture because new buildings are in this style.

Mr. Robinson explained the design. He said, "This building is made up primarily of clinics. The major area of the floor area in the building is for clinics. The clinics are around the outside walls with the exception of the [illegible] of the important requirements of the position was to be able to expand the building vertically to accommodate two floors. This is the completed status with a three-story requirement. Here is the future needs with a five-story requirement. With these rather broad generalizations, I think that is the building. The construction is fireproof. It is designed with a reinforced concrete frame with brick enclosing walls. The major part of the exterior facade is in brick with a trimming in limestone. There are three large windows and a canopy on the porch."

"The character of both the plan and the appearance of the building is to reflect two fundamental types in building use. The general public goes i here for distribution to the clinics. The students go in here and through a [illegible] building that appeals primarily at this point to the public use and in [illegible] general description of the building concept."

Chairman Finley asked if there were any questions. There being none, on motion of Mr. Bellsoch, seconded by Mr. Gerlson, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit H).

10. DESIGN FOR BIOLOGY-GREENHOUSE BUILDING: Mr. Hunter submitted the design and it was explained by Mr. Robinson, architect of Howard University. Mr. Robinson said:

"This is a building that is disposed rather close to a type of architectural style which is sometimes referred to as Georgian. On this end across the street (indicating) is a dormitory building that has rather strong Georgian stylistic detailing."

"This is a biology classroom building. We have a library over here (indicating) which is probably the most faithful interpretation of Georgian architecture of any building on the campus. Then we have one here (indicating) which has a Georgian character and these also (indicating) have a Georgian character. On the other hand we have a site arrangement that was inherited before this master plan was developed which seemed to indicate a sense of symmetric balance which had not been achieved."

"I merely want to show why this building takes the architectural character that it does. Since there is really no symmetrical balance in the whole place we felt that although we had Georgian influences around, that here was a building that could well take its point of solution from a reasoning use of the building and an integrating relation to the others in terms of being pleasing, on the basis of keeping the materials the same, and the generalaspect of the rhythm of openings and so on, fairly close to the pattern of these buildings around it."

"This is essentially a laboratory classroom building requiring a great deal of light. On top of it is a greenhouse, coming there by reason of limitation of sites available to place the greenhouse elsewhere."

"With this building we have attempted to build buildings which we could use having adequate light. We have come up with about the maximum openings in this facade that we could get that would accommodate anything that might look like Georgian and at the same time accommodate the need for natural light, so that we get this regularity of very large windows, just about on the border line; however, of requirement, and with the rhythm of spacing such as you see. We have a very long building because of limitation of site and we try to break that up by having a unit of building marked here, then a long portion, and then a repeat of that kind of thing in the existing building on the other end."

"There is an auditorium or a good-sized lecture room being placed outside of the main envelope for ease of access and for the economy of the whole thing. The greenhouse is at the top so as to get the maximum of sun exposure and the total amount of uninterrupted research. As to materials, the building surface will be primarily brick of the same character as that of the surrounding buildings, with limestone trim on all of the wall copings, and the main entrance, with no attempt at monumental treatment."

In response to Professor Hudnut's inquiry as to where they got the idea of colonial style, Mr. Robinson said, "It certainly is not mine. But in this case we felt that we had a purpose." Thereupon on motion of Professor Hudnut, seconded by Mr. deWeldon, the Commission approved the design (Exhibit I).

[illegible] Turner mentioned the design and it was explained by Mr. Robinson, architect of Queen University.

Mr. Robinson said:

"This is a building that is disposed [illegible] to a type of architectural style which is sometimes referred to as Georgian.

(indicating) is a dormitory building that [illegible]

"This is a biology classroom building. We have a library [illegible] (indicating) which is probably the most faithful interpretation of architecture of any building on the campus. There we have one here (indicating) which has a Georgian character and there also (indicating) have a Georgian character. On the other hand we have a site arrangement that was laid out before this master plan was developed which seems to indicate a [illegible] symmetric balance which had not been achieved.

"I merely want to show why this building bears the architectural character [illegible]

we felt that although we had Georgian influences around, that here was a building that really [illegible]

building and an integrating relation to the others [illegible] on the basis of keeping the materials the same, and rhythm of openings and so on, fairly close to the path around it."

"This is essentially a laboratory classroom [illegible] of light. On top of it is a greenhouse, [illegible] of sites available to place the greenhouse elsewhere.

"With this building we have attempted to build [illegible] facade that we could get that would accommodate [illegible] Georgian and at the same time accommodate the need for natural light, so that we get this regularity of very large windows, that [illegible] of requirements, and with the rhythm of [illegible] very long building because of limitation of site and we say to ourselves that by having a unit of building marked here, then a long portion, and then a repeat of that kind of thing in the existing building on the other.

"There is an auditorium or a good-sized lecture room being placed on [illegible] of the main envelope for ease of access and for the [illegible] of the greenhouse is at the top so as to get the maximum of sun [illegible] total amount of a uninterrupted research. As to materials, the building will be primarily brick of the same character as that of the [illegible] buildings, with limestone trim on all of the well [illegible], and the with no attempt at monumental treatment."

[illegible] here they got the idea of colonial style, Mr. Robinson said, "It certainly is not mine. But in this case we felt that we had a purpose." Thereupon on motion of Councillor [illegible], seconded by Mr. [illegible], the Commission approved the design (Exhibit 4).

11. SCULPTURE FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HEALTH BUILDING: Mr. C. David Persina, Chief of the Design Division, Public Buildings Administration explained this project. Mr. Persina said that there will be eight panels, sculptured, measuring 10" x 14" each, that will portray great personages in medicine, as Major Reed, and physicists as Marie Curie, as also Roentgen, discoverer of the X-Ray. Regarding inscriptions, this question is being debated, but there will be some means of identification. They will be cast in aluminum, in low relief, The eight panels are for elevator doors, modeled by Vincent Glinsky, sculptor, of New York City. There will be four panels on each side of a hall.

Mr. deWeldon said, "I think the design is fine, but I would like to see the models for these panels. Accordingly, the Commission agreed that Mr. deWeldon and Mr. Biddle should visit the studio of the sculptor in New York some time during the month to inspect the models.

12. SCULPTURE FOR THE NEW FEDERAL COURT HOUSE: Mr. Persina said, "This submission involves four portraits of eminent jurists, by Edwin C. Rust, sculptor, to be placed in the Court of Appeals Room in the new Court House at Third Street and Constitution Avenue, N. W., namely, King Alfred, Blackstone, Storey and Marshall. Those are the subjects selected by the committee of judges appointed by the Congressional committee. They selected the subjects. These are for two panels at opposite sides of the room, representing justice and law. They will be in bronze, life size." Mr. Persina showed from a drawing where they would be located. There will be no inscription since the committee of judges ruled against it.

Mr. Peets said he would like to see lettering, probably to be carved in the wood, and Mr. deWeldon said he would concur in this suggestion. Thereupon the Commission approved the models, based on the photographs submitted. (Exhibit J).

11. SCULPTURE FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTS & LETTERS: Mr. C. David Fersina, Chief of the Design Division, Public Buildings Administration explained this project. Mr. Fersina said that there will be eight panels, approximately measuring 10" x 14" each, that will portray great personages in medicine, as major head, and physicists as marie Curie, or also Southern, discoverer of the X-Ray. Regarding inscriptions, this question is being consulted, but there will be some means of identification. They will be cast in aluminum, in low relief. The eight panels are for elevator doors, modeled by vincent Glinsky, sculptor of New York City. There will be four panels on each side of a hall.

Mr. Gerhardon said, "I think the design is fine, but I would like to see

and Mr. Biddle should visit the studio of the sculptor in New York some time during the month to inspect the models.

12. SCULPTURE FOR THE NEW FEDERAL COURT IN [illegible]. Fersina said, "This submission involves four portraits of eminent jurists, by Adolph G. Ernst, a sculptor, to be placed in the Court of Appeals room in the new Court House at

Storey and Marshall. These are the subjects selected by the committee of judges appointed by the Congressional committee. They selected the subjects. These are for two panels at opposite sides of the room, representing justice and law. They will be in bronze, life size." Mr. Fersina showed from a drawing where they would be located. There will be no inscription since the committee of judges ruled against it.

Mr. Peets said he would like to see [illegible], probably to be carved in the wood, and Mr. Gerhardon said he would concur in this suggestion.

Commission approves the models, based on the photographs submitted. (Exhibit 1).

13. REPAVING THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Mr. Hillary A. Tolson, Acting Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior presented the subject of repaving the Arlington Memorial Bridge, because, although some months ago the Commission of Fine Arts had decided that the existing Durex granite blocks should be retained, treated, however, so that they will cease to be slippery, the Bureau of Public Roads, which is generally in charge of Highway construction for the Government , now recommends the use of asphalt pavement. Mr. H. J. Spelman of the Bureau of Public Roads presented the arguments for the use of asphalt, which, he said, is now after about twenty years of a higher type than it was when the Arlington Memorial Bridge was dedicated in 1932. Major General U. S. Grant III (Retired), Executive Officer of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission when constructed, was present and urged retention of the Durex granite blocks. Also Mr. Harry Thompson, Assistant Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, spoke in favor of retaining them, since it would be far less costly to do so.

It was decided to refer this matter to the Commission of Fine Arts for study until the next meeting of the Commission on November 21st.

A copy of the discussion on the subject is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit K).

14. MISCELLANEOUS SUBMISSIONS UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT:

(a) The Commission approved application No. 1368, submitting designs for a residence at 1840 North Portal Drive.

(b) The Commission approved application No. 1367, for a residence at 6980 Oregon Avenue, N. W.

(c) The Commission approved application No. 1364 for alteration of a store building adjacent to the Evening Star Newspaper office, which is at Eleventh St. and Pennsylvania Ave., and is to be occupied by that firm. The building will be faced with limestone from the second floor up. A drug store is on the first floor.

(d) Application No. 1370 for a sign at 60 Canal Street, S. W., was approved.

(e) Application No. 1369 for a sign on a store building at 605 Fifteenth Street, opposite the Treasury Department, was approved.

(f) Sign for Johnson's Restaurant: The Secretary submitted a revised design for a sign at Johnson's Restaurant at 27th Street and the Rock Creek Parkway. This was inspected by the Commission and disapproved. The Commission felt that not sufficient study had been given to the design.

Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior recommend the subject of repaving the Arlington Memorial Bridge, because, although some members of the Commission of Fine Arts had doubted that the existing Jonas granite blocks should be retained, treated, however, so that they will cease to be slippery, the Bureau of Public Roads, which is generally in charge of highway construction for the Government, now recommends the use of asphalt pavement. Mr. L. S. Upchurch of the Bureau of Public Roads presented the arguments for one kind of pavement, which, he said, is now after about twenty years of a higher type than in use when the Arlington Memorial Bridge was constructed in 1932. Capt. Lawrence H. Frank III (Retired), Executive Director of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission when constructed, was present and urged reconsideration of the Jonas granite blocks. Also Mr. Harry Thomson, Assistant Superintendent of the Office of National Capital Parks, National Park Service, spoke in favor of retaining them, since it would be far less costly to do so.

It was decided to refer this matter to the Commission of Fine Arts for study until the next meeting of the Commission on November 21st.

A copy of the discussion on the subject is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit K).

Action:

(a) The Commission approved application No. 1706, submitted at 1440 Potomac Drive.
(b) The Commission approved application No. 1707, for a residence at 6410 Oregon Avenue, N. W.
(c) The Commission approved application No. 1604 for alteration of a building adjacent to the Evening Star Newspaper Office, which is at Three and Pennsylvania Ave., and is to be occupied by that firm. The facade with limestone from the second floor up. A drug store is

(d) Application No. 1370 for a sign at 50 Grant Street, S. W., was approved.
(e) Application No. 1697 for a sign on a store building at 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, opposite the Treasury Department, was approved.
(f) Sign for Johnson's Restaurant: The Secretary submitted a revised design for a sign at Johnson's Restaurant at 2700 Street and the Navy Dome Terrace. This was tabled by the Commission and disapproved. The Commission felt that not sufficient study had been given to the design.

15. INSPECTION OF THE OCTAGON, AND LUNCHEON: The Commission were invited by the American Institute of Architects to inspect Historic Octagon House, the Headquarters of The American Institute of Architects, at Eighteenth Street and New York Avenue, Northwest, and be the guest of honor at luncheon.

The Commission were pleased to inspect the building, which has recently been renovated and restored in places, to be maintained henceforth as an "historic shrine," one of the chief buildings of historic buildings in the National Capital. The house was built by John Tayloe about 1800 after a design by Dr. William Thornton. It is said George Washington chose the site for his friend Tayloe. The house has further historic interest in that it was used as a temporary White House after the burning of the Executive Mansion by the British in 1814. The rooms were beautifully decorated in post colonial style of the period.

After the luncheon, Chairman Finley brought up the subject of the newly adopted law to protect "Historic Georgetown." He informed the guests that the Commission had been considering the personnel for the Architectural Board of Review provided for in the Act, and were suggesting three architects, namely, in general architects who lived in the vicinity of Georgetown.

In the discussion the following architects were suggested: Mr. Macomber, architect of Mount Vernon; Mr. Winslow, architect of the White House; Mr. Wm. Dewey Foster, architect, of Washington. These three were agreed on to form the first "Committee."

For a second panel there were recommended Mr. L. M. Leisenring, Mr. Fred Brooks and Mr. Horace Peaslee, all of Washington.

16. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission called at the Freer Gallery of Art, where the Director, Mr. Archibald G. Wenley, presented objects of art proposed for purchase. The Commission expressed interest in them and approved them for purchase (Exhibit L).

15. INSPECTION OF THE COTTAGE, AND LUNCH: The Commission were invited by the American Institute of Architects to inspect Historic Cottage Houses, the Headquarters of The American Institute of Architects, at Sixteenth Street and New York Avenue, Northwest, and be the guest of honor at luncheon.

The Commission were pleased to inspect the building, which has recently been renovated and restored in places, to be maintained henceforth as an "historic shrine," one of the chief buildings or historic buildings in the National Capital. The house was built by John Tayloe about 1800 after a design by Dr. William Thornton. It is said George Washington chose the site for his friend Tayloe. The house has further historic interest in that it was used as a temporary White House after the burning of the Executive Mansion by the British in 1814. The rooms were beautifully decorated in good colonial style of the period.

After the luncheon, Chairman Shipley brought up the subject of the newly adopted law to protect "Historic Georgetown." He informed the guests that the Commission had been considering the personnel for the architectural Board of Review provided for in the act, and were suggesting three architects, namely, in general architects who lived in the vicinity of Georgetown.

In the discussion the following architects were [illegible] architect of Mount Vernon; Mr. Shipley, architect of [illegible] Dewey Foster, architect, of Washington. These three were agreed on to form [illegible]

For a second panel there were recommended Mr. A. A. Leisenring, Mr. Fred Brooks and Mr. Horace Peaslee, all of Washington.

16. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission called at the Freer Gallery of Art, [illegible] proposed for purchase. The Commission expressed interest in them and approve them for purchase (Exhibit I).

17. PAINTINGS OF WAR SCENES: Mr. Biddle strongly recommended that a program be adopted by the Department of National Defense to commission artists to paint "battle front" scenes, as well as others that would be of cultural interest, in war zones, particularly Korea at this time. He called attention to such paintings, pictures of which appeared in LIFE in the issue of October 9, 1950. Unless some action is taken promptly, Mr. Biddle said, the effectiveness of such scenes will be lost. Whereas, if the work is undertaken now, it will be of great interest and value in future years.

The Commission generally concurred in this suggestion of Mr. Biddle, and it was concluded that a letter should be written to the Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, concerning this matter.

Returning to his home, Mr. Biddle concluded that it might be best for him to confer with General Marshall personally on the subject, and, accordingly, wrote to Chairman Finley, who concurred in this plan of procedure (Exhibit M).

18. PAINTINGS AND SCULPTURE FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Mr. Biddle urged that the work of the former "Section of Fine Arts" of the Public Buildings Administration be revived to provide paintings and sculpture for public buildings throughout the country.

Chairman Finley informed Mr. Biddle that from the time the Section of Fine Arts ceased to exist as an organization, several years ago, the Office of the Supervising Architect, of the Public Buildings Administration, General Services, has continued the work, though on a rather restricted scale. A certain percentage of an appropriation for a public building is being set aside for paintings and sculpture, and designs and models for such projects as they relate to the District of Columbia are being submitted by that Office

IV. PAINTINGS OF WAR ZONES: Mr. Biddle strongly recommended that a program be adopted by the Department of National Defence to commission artists to paint "battle front" scenes, as well as other fine works of cultural interest, in war zones, particularly those at this time. He called attention to such paintings, pictures of which appeared in LIFE in the issue of October 9, 1950. Unless some action is taken promptly, Mr. Biddle said, the effectiveness of such scenes will be lost. Whereas, if the work is [illegible] now, it will be of great interest and value in future years.

The Commission generally concurred in this suggestion of Mr. Biddle, and it was concluded that a letter should be written to the Secretary of Defence [illegible].

Returning to his home, Mr. Biddle concluded that it might be been for him to confer with General Marshall personally on the subject, and accordingly, wrote to Chairman Finlay, who concurred in this plan of procedure (Exhibit "[illegible]").

[illegible]

the work of the former "Section of Fine Arts" of the Public Buildings Administration be revived to provide paintings and sculpture for public buildings throughout the country.

Chairman Finlay informed Mr. Biddle that at the time the Section of Fine Arts ceased to exist as an organization, several years ago, the Office of the Supervising Architect, of the Public Buildings Administration, General [illegible]

certain percentage of an appropriation for a public building is being set aside for paintings and sculpture, and designs and models for such projects as they relate to the District of Columbia are being submitted by that Office

regularly---the submissions this morning of sculpture for the new Court House and the Bethesda Hospital are cases in point. However, designs for paintings and sculpture, throughout the country generally, do not have the supervision of this Commission, only in exceptional cases, or generally when some controversy is involved.

The Commission felt that it would be a good thing if this program were definitely revived on a national basis, even to the extent of having the President of the United States issue an Executive Order on the subject. The Commission decided to bring the matter to the attention of the Honorable Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services (Exhibit N).

19. EXHIBITIONS OF PAINTINGS AND SCULPTURE: Mr. Biddle inquired whether or not the Commission of Fine Arts could arrange for Exhibitions of Paintings and Sculpture that could be sent to leading cities in this country and abroad. He felt it would be a contribution to The Fine Arts if this could be done.

Chairman Finley explained that the Commission of Fine Arts has not undertaken such work, in the first place because Congress has not provided funds for it; and, secondly, because Fine Arts projects of an educational character have never been included in the general duties of the Commission. The American Federation of Arts does sponsor such exhibitions; also the Pan American Union. The National Gallery of Art has sponsored and arranged some such exhibitions, especially to Latin America, through limited grants of funds provided from time to time during the past decade, and is both prepared and equipped to do such work in the future, provided funds are made available.

20. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Tuesday, November 21, 1950.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

regularly---the subsidiaries this morning of coal time for the new Court House and the Entrada Hospital are cases in point. However, designs for painting and sculpture, throughout the country, generally, do not have the concentration of this Commission, only in exceptional cases, or generally when some controversy is involved.

The Commission felt that it would be a good thing if this program were definitely revived on a national basis, even to the extent of having the President of the United States issue an executive order on the subject. The Commission decided to bring the matter to the attention of the Honorable Jesse Larson, Administrator of General Services (Exhibit 1).

19. TRADITIONS OF FLIMTIMOS AND SCULPTURE: Mr. Mark Inglehart wondered or not the Commission of Fine Arts could arrange for exhibitions of painting and sculpture that could be sent to leading cities in this country and abroad. He felt it would be a contribution to The Fine Arts if this could be done.

Chairman Finley explained that the Commission of Fine Arts has not undertaken such work, in the first place because Congress has not provided funds for it; and, secondly, because Fine Arts projects of an educational character have never been included in the general duties of the Commission. The American Federation of Arts does sponsor such exhibitions; also the Pan American Union. The National Gallery of Art has sponsored and arranged some such exhibitions, especially to Latin America, through limited grants of funds provided from time to time during the past decade, and is both prepared and equipped to do such work in the future, provided funds are made available.

20. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION: The Commission decided to hold their next meeting in Washington on Tuesday, November 21, 1950.

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

COPY

BUDGET, COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS, FISCAL YEAR 1952.

01 Personal Services,		
Permanent positions:		
Administrative Officer, G.S. 13, (Secretary),	$7600.	
Research Assistant (G. S. 8)	4200.	
Clerk-Stenographer (G.S.4)	2875.	
Messenger (Crafts,Protective,Custodial (C.P.C.2)	2120.	
01 Total		$16,795.
02 Travel Expenses for 9 official meetings during the year (Cost per meeting $800, plus $800 for Committee meetings)		8,000.
04 Communication Service (Telegraph and telephone		505.
06 Printing and Binding		500.
07 Other contracual services (Including the making of photographs, purchase of photographs, photostats and prints)		700.
08 Supplies and material		500.
		27,000.

EXHIBIT A

[PUBLIC LAW 808—81ST CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 984—2D SESSION]

[H. R. 7670]

AN ACT

To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semi-public buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created in the District of Columbia a district known as "Old Georgetown" which is bounded on the east by Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway from the Potomac River to the north boundary of Dumbarton Oaks Park, on the north by the north boundary of Dumbarton Oaks Park, Whitehaven Street and Whitehaven Parkway to Thirty-fifth Street, south along the middle of Thirty-fifth Street to Reservoir Road, west along the middle of Reservoir Road to Archbold Parkway, on the west by Archbold Parkway from Reservoir Road to the Potomac River, on the south by the Potomac River to the Rock Creek Parkway.

SEC. 2. In order to promote the general welfare and to preserve and protect the places and areas of historic interest, exterior architectural features and examples of the type of architecture used in the National Capital in its initial years, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, before issuing any permit for the construction, alteration, reconstruction, or razing of any building within said Georgetown district described in section 1 shall refer the plans to the National Commission of Fine Arts for a report as to the exterior architectural features, height, appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction which is subject to public view from a public highway. The National Commission of Fine Arts shall report promptly to said Commissioners of the District of Columbia its recommendations, including such changes, if any, as in the judgment of the Commission are necessary and desirable to preserve the historic value of said Georgetown district. The said Commissioners shall take such actions as in their judgment are right and proper in the circumstances: *Provided*, That, if the said Commission of Fine Arts fails to submit a report on such plans within forty-five days, its approval thereof shall be assumed and a permit may be issued.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the purpose of this Act, the Commission of Fine Arts is hereby authorized to appoint a committee of three architects, who shall serve as a board of review without expense to the United States and who shall advise the Commission of Fine Arts, in writing, regarding designs and plans referred to it.

SEC. 4. Said Commissioners of the District of Columbia, with the aid of the National Park Service and of the National Park and Planning Commission, shall make a survey of the "Old Georgetown" area for the use of the Commission of Fine Arts and of the building permit office of the District of Columbia, such survey to be made at a cost not exceeding $8,000, which amount is hereby authorized.

EXHIBIT B

SEC. 5. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as superseding or affecting in any manner any Act of Congress heretofore enacted relating to the alteration, repair, or demolition of insanitary or unsafe dwellings or other structures.

Approved September 22, 1950.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 13, 1950

Dear Mr. Macomber:

We are delighted to know that it is agreeable to you to serve on the committee of architects, for the protection of "Old Georgetown."

Accordingly, you are hereby appointed a member of the Committee of Architects, as authorized by Public Law No. 808, 81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950, "To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semi-public buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital." Also, we desire that you serve as Chairman of the Committee.

A copy of the Law above-mentioned is enclosed.

Arrangements for a meeting of the Committee will be made in the near future, and you will be informed of the date and place of meeting.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Walter M. Macomber, Architect,
Burke, Virginia.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 16, 1950

Dear Mr. Winslow:

In accordance with your letter of October 12th, you are hereby appointed a member of the Committee of Architects, as authorized by Public Law No. 808, 81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950, "To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semi-public buildings, in the Georgetown area of the National Capital." A copy of the Law is enclosed.

Arrangements for a meeting of the Committee will be made in the near future, and you will be informed of the date and place of meeting.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Lorenzo S. Winslow, Architect,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-1

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 16, 1950

Dear Mr. Foster:

In accordance with your letter of October 12th, you are hereby appointed a member of the Committee of Architects, as authorized by Public Law No. 808, 81st Congress, approved September 22, 1950, "To regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semi-public buildings in the Georgetown area of the National Capital." A copy of the Law is enclosed.

Arrangements for a meeting of the Committee will be made in the near future, and you will be informed of the date and place of meeting. We note that you will be out of the city until November 1st.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Wm. Dewey Foster, Architect,
1636 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, 9, D. C.

EXHIBIT C-2

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

September 11, 1950

Dear Mr. Davis:

With reference to submission No. 1359, dated August 25, 1950, for The Benjamin Franklin Building at 315 Third Street, N.W. (Third and C Streets, N.W.), designed by Leon Chatelain, Architect, 1727 K Street, N. W., I have to report that the architect members of this Commission are giving study to the design, and it will receive the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their next meeting to be held in Washington on October 6th next.

Objection has been made to the glass (horizontal) treatment at the corners; also that the entrance is out of proportion to the rest of the building. These are main objections and they have been brought to the attention of the architect. I am informed that he will revise his design accordingly.

In the meantime the "Owners" of the building do not wish to lose valuable time, pending final approval of the design by the Commission of Fine Arts. Therefore, in behalf of the Commission I wish to ask that you grant the "Owners" a permit to begin excavations at the site and also a permit to begin on the foundations, with the understanding that the architect will make such necessary changes in his drawings as will conform to the design approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. Such letter should, of course, be addressed to you by the architect.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley
Chairman.

Mr. Robert H. Davis
Director of Inspection
Engineer Department, D.C.

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D-1

[illegible]

[illegible] to [illegible]. [illegible]

[illegible] building [illegible]

designed by [illegible] architect, [illegible]

[illegible]

it will receive the [illegible] of [illegible] as their [illegible]

ing to be held in [illegible] on [illegible]

[illegible] objection [illegible]

comment [illegible] conference

These are high objectives [illegible] on [illegible] of [illegible]

architect. I am [illegible] [illegible]

In the [illegible] of [illegible]

valuable time, [illegible] approval of the [illegible]

ing. Therefore, [illegible]

"general" [illegible] to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

foundation of the city. [illegible] should, of course, [illegible]

the architect.

[illegible]

Director of [illegible]
Engineer Department, U.S.A.

Washington, D. C.

COPY

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
Washington, D. C.

August [illegible], [illegible]

Mr. W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

Subject: Private developments in Northwest and Southwest Public Building Areas

My dear Mr. Reynolds:

From time to time this Commission has brought to the attention of the Public Buildings Service proposed private building developments within the areas authorized for acquisition under the Public Buildings Act of 1926, as amended.

Two such proposals have come to the attention of the Commission within the last few weeks. One is for the construction of a 189 unit 6-story apartment building at 25th and E Streets, N. W. (Lots 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, Square 33), and the other is a proposed gasoline service station at 636-640 Maryland Avenue, S.W. (Lot 805, Square 463).

Both of these projects point up the need for some action to protect the Government's investment in adjoining areas, in terms of major commitment [illegible] made for related land acquisition or actual development in accordance with a plan for the completion of which these properties are essential.

In the case of the 25th and E Street properties (now vacant), we understand that funds were made available recently to acquire adjacent key properties for further Northwest rectangle development and that these may be sufficient for inclusion of the properties described above. The Commission recommends that the Public Buildings Service acquire these lots at this time for emergency or other practical purposes, such as temporary use for a parking lot for which there is an already established need.

In the case of the Southwest building area, the Commission urges the Public Buildings Service to place the remaining privately owned properties in this section on a high priority basis, and seek funds for early acquisition for temporary building or parking purposes pending the need for completing permanent public building plans at some later date. Contrary to recent reporting in the press, the Commission is not advocating the construction of permanent office buildings on these areas at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

A. E. Demaray
Acting Chairman.

JN:md

EXHIBIT E

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

September 11, 1950

Mr. Garfield I. Kass, President
Kass Realty Company, Inc.
4461 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Kass:

I received your letter of September 6th concerning your proposed commercial building to be erected at Twenty-first Street and Virginia Avenue, Northwest. I shall read the letter to The Commission of Fine Arts at their next meeting on October 6th. If you care to submit a revised design of the building, as suggested in my letter addressed to you on July 25th, I will also be glad to submit this design to the Commission. If you do not wish to do this, you are at liberty to proceed in any way you think best.

I should call your attention to the fact that The Commission of Fine Arts raised serious objections to the rendering submitted by you, which did not disclose a tall chimney above the building, hidden, in the rendering, by a drawing of a tree. The Commission feel they must have a clear rendering of the building which conforms to the blueprint.

In the event that you wish to submit a revised design for the consideration of the Commission, Professor F. V. Murphy, former architect member of The Commission of Fine Arts, whose office is at 1518 P Street, Northwest, is willing to consult with your architect as to the changes that, in his opinion, might meet the objections of The Commission of Fine Arts.

Very truly yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley
Chairman.

DEF:mc

EXHIBIT F

EXTRACT FROM THE 13th REPORT OF
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS --
Pages 79-80

Congress amended the Shipstead-Luce Act by legislation approved July 31, 1939, so as to include Lafayette Park, as follows:

(Public--No. 248--76th Congress)

(Chapter 400--1st Session)

(H. R. 5660)

AN ACT To include Lafayette Park within the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital", approved May 16, 1930.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second [illegible] 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semipublic buildings in certain areas of the National Capital", approved May 16, 1930 (U.S.C., 1934 edition, title 40, sec. 121), is amended to read as follows: "To this end, hereafter when application is made for permit for the erection or alteration of any building, any portion of which is to front or abut upon the grounds of the Capitol, the grounds of the White House, the portion of Pennsylvania Avenue extending from the Capitol to the White House, Lafayette Park, Rock Creek Park, the Zoological Park, the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway, Potomac Park, The Mall Park System and public buildings adjacent thereto, or abutting upon any street bordering any of said grounds or parks, the plans therefor, so far as they relate to height and appearance, color, and texture of the materials of exterior construction, shall be submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to the Commission of Fine Arts; and the said Commission shall report promptly to said Commissioners its recommendations, including such changes, if any, as in its judgment are necessary to prevent reasonably avoidable impairment of the public values belonging to such public building or park; and said Commissioners shall take such action as shall, in their judgment, effect reasonable compliance with such recommendation: Provided, That if the said Commission of Fine Arts ~~a~~ fails to report its approval or disapproval of such plans within thirty days, its approval thereof shall be assumed and a permit may be issued."

Approved, July 31, 1939.

EXHIBIT G

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 9, 1950

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on October 6, 1950, approved the design submitted by your Office for (a) a Biology-Greenhouse Building, and (b) a Dental School Building, to be built at Howard University.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Hon. W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
General Services,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H + I

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

[illegible], 195[illegible]

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on October 6, 1950, approved the full size models in clay by Edwin C. Rust, sculptor, of distinguished jurists, based on the photographs submitted. The Commission noted that this sculpture is to be cast in bronze and to consist of six panels for the Circuit Court of Appeals Room.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Hon. W. E. Reynolds,
Commissioner of Public Buildings,

General Services,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT U

C O P Y

Discussion on REPAVING THE ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE

STATEMENT OF HILLORY A. TOLSON,

ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. Tolson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we are here today in connection with a matter which you have already approved; the proposed resurfacing of the Arlington Memorial Bridge. It is now paved with granite blocks. The funds have been made available by Congress for the work. However, a question has been raised by the Bureau of Public Roads as to whether the granite block is a proper type of surfacing for the bridge. We should like to have your consideration of the statement which the representative of the Bureau of Public Roads desires to make to you this morning.

Mr. H. J. Spelman is here from that agency. If there is any further information you should like to have in connection with the granite block type of paving, Mr. Harry Thompson, who is the associate superintendent of National Capital Parks can present it.

STATEMENT OF HARRY T. THOMPSON

ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS

Mr. Thompson. Gentlemen, I will try to keep my story as brief as I can. You will find it somewhat repetitious. It may be worthwhile at this time to review the history of the origin of the bridge and how it came about. It was exactly 100 years ago that Andrew Jackson suggested that a stone arch bridge be constructed across the Potomac River. That vision was kept alive throughout the years by various commissions which were born and died but finally in 1931 there was a commission able to bring into reality this stone arch across the Potomac. At that time General Grant was in charge of all the activities of the Park System here and was a member of the Commission. The architects chosen were McKim and White and, I am sure, at least from the record, that everyone at that time gave due consideration to all manners and types of pavements that could be used.

It was only after considerable research and investigation locally and in other parts of the world, and after consulting people in the top of their profession, engineering-wise and road building-wise and otherwise, that it was decided that the particular type of pavement now used should be used.

The Commission of Fine Arts at that time unanimously endorsed its use. The commission for the bridge endorsed its use. The consulting engineer so recommended. General Grant personally so recommended and he, on his own volition, made considerable research in England and other places to determine its suitability and feasibility for a surfacing of this kind.

At that time, as I also recall, even though it could have been paved with a less expensive material, it was considered advisable and it was presented to all the agencies and persons concerned that durex paving would cost two and four-tenths times as much as an asphalt surface, but that it was the proper thing to do to expend that additional money. It was presented to the President and the Vice President who were members of the commission at that time. They also concurred that ~~that~~ paving with durex was the thing to do.

I think we should keep in mind that as of now the bridge has not yet been completed because the memorial character and features of the bridge have not been completed. There has been additional traffic over the bridge which was not originally contemplated. We have had the addition of buses, trucks, the

Discussion on TRANSFER THE ARLINGTON Bridge

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM A. TOLSON,

Mr. Tolson. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am here today with a matter which you have already approved: the Lincoln Memorial Arlington Memorial Bridge. It is now served with graceful bridge

been raised by the Bureau of Public Roads as to whether the proper type of structure for the bridge. We should like to have your consideration of the statement which the representative of the Bureau of Public Roads desires to make to you this morning.

Mr. R. G. Spaulding is here from that agency. If there is any further information you would like to have in connection with the graceful bridge, Mr. Harry Thompson, who is the associate representative of National Capital Parks can present it.

STATEMENT OF HARRY T. THOMPSON

Mr. Thompson. Gentlemen, I will try to keep my story as brief as I can. You will find it somewhat repetitious. It was a wonderful at that time to review the history of the origin of the Arlington Memorial Bridge. It was exactly 100 years ago that Andrew Jackson suggested that a stone arch should be constructed across the Potomac River. That vision was kept alive throughout the years by various commissions which were from time to time. In 1921 there was a commission made to bring in a report which was the Robbins. At that time Congress was in charge of all the action of the Bureau here and was a member of the Commission. The Chairman was Colonel and Mrs. Lincoln, at Lowell from the country, and everyone at that time gave due consideration to all sources and types of materials that could be used.

It was only after considerable research and investigation locally and in other parts of the world, and after consulting people in the [illegible] profession, engineering-wise and from building-wise and otherwise, that it was decided that the particular type of structure may meet the [illegible]

The Commission of Fine Arts at that time [illegible]

The commission for the bridge approved its use. The consulting engineer recommended. General Grant personally in recommending [illegible] on the [illegible] volution, made considerable research in Ireland and other places to determine its suitability and feasibility for a structure of this kind.

At that time, as I also recall, even though it could have been never built a less expensive material. It was considered reasonable and it was recommended to all the engineers and persons concerned that [illegible] would cost two and four-tenths times as much as an asphalt surface, but that it was the proper thing to do to expend that additional money. I was remembered to the President and the Fine Commission who were members of the commission at that time. They also concurred that that [illegible] was the thing to do.

I think we should keep in mind that as of now the bridge has not yet been completed because the memorial characters and features of the bridge have not been completed. There has been additional traffic over the bridge which was not originally contemplated. We have had the addition of lanes, [illegible]

hauling of heavy materials across it. There has also been the absence of funds to keep a yearly maintenance program going. During the war years it is true that the bridge surface has deteriorated. We have, as Mr. Spelman has told you, made efforts to relay some of the small bits and pieces that have gotten out of level and out of line but they were not done properly in that the men doing it used a concrete grout, a wet concrete grout instead of a dry grout. It was laid in a grout consisting of 1 part cement and 4 parts sand which is the conventional method used throughout this country and particularly in Europe. Some of us believe that if a richer grout were used it might be more effective. In pursuing my views, I may be accused of being a sentimentalist. I am willing to accept that onus because I am firmly of the opinion that the integrity of that bridge should be preserved by the continued use of a paving such as is now on the surface.

We did make experimental tests for skidding and, even though we took off the surface by spalling the surface with heat, the tests did not prove as satisfactory as I hoped they would. Following that we reduced the speed from an unlimited speed to 30 miles per hour. During this past summer the amount of accidents on the bridge has been reduced greatly, according to unofficial estimates by our police. We have made a survey of the traffic accidents on the Arlington Bridge as compared with the old 14th Street Bridge previously existing which had an almost flat surface paved with asphalt. Lane for lane and car for car using both bridges, there were no more accidents on the Arlington Bridge than took place upon the 14th Street Bridge so that even though we do have a higher crown and a steeper cross section and some irregularities on the Memorial Bridge, I do not think that the entire fault can be attributed to the crown and cross section, or even the roughness.

The reduced speed has contributed to the point where the number of accidents, amount of traffic considered, has been reduced on the bridge. When you stand upon the far side of the river on the portico of the Lee Mansion and look down, you see now the continuity of Memorial Avenue with the black pavement on this end and the white line carrying across to the other end. My concern is that it would tend to lay another ribbon of asphalt across the bridge, giving a black band upon which you are riding with two white lines on each side. The Bridge then appears to be in three pieces. It is no longer an integral unit. It is no longer the memorial as it was intended to be.

I think we have to keep in mind that this was conceived as a memorial to our hero dead and those of us who are now charged with its care and its upkeep should not feel free to change from time to time the elements of the bridge that go to make up its memorial character. Pretty soon the memorial character would be lost.

We might feel that way about the Washington Memorial or the Lincoln Memorial some day but we should remember that the thing has been established in its present state and we should not feel free to willy-nilly change for some minor reason the whole character of such a structure.

I have just returned from Europe and I find that there they are still laying square yards, square miles and hundreds of miles of pavement just as you see it here. They have traffic which travels at about the same speed that we travel here.

Getting back to the practical considerations of what happens if you put asphalt on it, in accordance with the suggestion of the Public Roads Administration -- and I wish you would correct me if I misquote your intention, Mr. Spelman. As I read the proposal it means the ripping out of all of the interlocking expansion joints, some 18 in number and readjusting them to the new cross section of the crown. It means breaking into all the reinforcement of those joints where they have been set in concrete. It means ripping out some

[illegible] of heavy materials across it. There has also been [illegible] to keep a yearly maintenance program going. During the [illegible] made efforts to relay some of the small dips and places that have gotten out of level and out of line but they were not done properly in that the [illegible] used a concrete grout, a wet concrete grout instead of a dry grout. In the line in a grout consisting of 1 part cement and 1 parts sand which is the conventional method used throughout this country and particularly in Europe. [illegible] believe that if a richer grout were used it might be more effective. In [illegible] my views, I may be accused of being a sentimentalist. I am willing to [illegible] that cause because I am firmly of the opinion that the integrity of [illegible]

We did make experimental tests for smoothing out, even though we [illegible] surface by spalling the surface with hook, the bits do not prove so satisfactory as I hoped they would. Following that we removed the speed from [illegible] speed to 30 miles per hour. During this period [illegible] the bridge has been reduced greatly, according to unofficial estimates by our police. We have made a survey of the traffic accidents on the [illegible] as compared with the old 14th Street bridge previously existing which had an [illegible] flat surface paved with asphalt. Here for [illegible] bridges, there were no more accidents on the Arlington Bridge than took place upon the 14th Street Bridge so that even though we do have a higher [illegible] a steeper cross section and some irregularities on the Memorial Bridge, I do not think that the entire fault can be attributed to the crown and cross section, or even the roughness.

The reduced speed has contributed to the point where the number of reduced amount of traffic considered, has been reduced on the bridge. [illegible] upon the far side of the river on the corners of the [illegible] you see now the continuity of [illegible] Avenue with the black pavement on this and [illegible]

tend to lay another ribbon of asphalt across the bridge, giving a [illegible] which [illegible] two [illegible] there on each side. The [illegible] to be in three places. It is no longer an integral unit. It is no longer the memorial as it was intended to be.

I think we have to keep in mind that this was conceived as a memorial to our hero dead and those of us who were [illegible] when [illegible] and life [illegible] should not feel free to change from time to time the elements of the bridge [illegible] go to make up its memorial character. Rather keep the memorial character [illegible] be lost.

We might feel that my about the Washington [illegible] some day but we should remember that the bridge has been established in the present state and we should not feel free to willy-nilly change for some minor reason the whole character of such a structure.

I have just returned from Europe and I find that there they are [illegible] square yards, square miles and hundreds of miles of [illegible] here. They have traffic which travels at about the same speed that we travel.

Getting back to the practical considerations of what happens if you put asphalt on it, in accordance with the suggestion of the Public Roads Administration -- and I wish you would correct me if I misquote your [illegible] department. As I read the proposal it means the stripping out of all of the [illegible] cross section of the crown. It means breaking into all the reinforcements [illegible]

40 catch basins on the edge. It means the installation of an entirely new feature which I think is entirely uncalled for and namely a new granite curb on all of the bridge except for the bascule span, which would be different, possibly of metal. It means the ripping out of the existing curb and the lessening of the width of the existing walkways on the bridge ends. When you get all through you have devoted about one-fourth of your appropriation to the actual surfacing of the bridge and three-fourths of it to the re-creation of a new crown which in its entirety from gutter line to gutter line gives you a betterment of one and five-eights inches on the outer lane. For that much accomplishment I don't believe you are improving the cross section enough to make it worthwhile because you still have your vertical arches and you still have some crown in your cross section. You have added new guard rails, as yet undesigned, on the curbs.

Since it has been built there have been more than 100 million cars cross the bridge and of those 100 million, 1 has accidentally jumbed the curb. That could happen in any mile stretch of road anywhere in the world. Whether a new curb would have saved that particular accident is somewhat questionable. I don't know, but I doubt it.

The introduction of new curbs, the introduction of a metal band across the bascule, the accomplishment of one and five-eighths inches in your cross section of the outer lane, the establishment of a black top surface which we hope will probably lessen in some degree the slipperiness of the pavement when it is wet but will be no better than the durex when it is dry, I feel rather keenly and strongly as I have said to this Commission before, that we ought to do everything that we possibly could do, to preserve the integrity of the bridge since it is a memorial, and that there ought to be some way found to keep the pavement there -- even lessen the speed to 25 miles an hour if there are too many accidents. I do not want to belabor you with any more details and lines of reasoning, but I hope when you come to take action, that you will confirm your approval of the durex and help us find some practical way of reducing the traffic or applying a treatment of some kind by continued maintenance to hold the surface as it now exists.

Chairman Finley. Do you have sufficient funds now to maintain the bridge properly so you could do something about the surface?

Mr. Thompson. We could not out of our maintenance fund do a proper job. The proper job of maintenance would require the lifting of the blocks. That is a job for 20 or 30 men and not two or three.

The funds now set up are for construction and they are not in the category of maintenance.

Chairman Finley. I think one of the first things to do is to reduce the speed limit.

Mr. Thompson. I have asked our police for a tabulation this morning and they didn't have time to prepare a record of accidents so I asked for their best guess as to the reduction in accidents and they have guessed 25 to 35 per cent, which is a considerable saving.

Mr. deWeldon. Would it not be proper to bring the surface up on the sides?

Mr. Thompson. We have tried bush hammering, we have invented a multiple jack hammer, we have tried driving them, we have tried peen hammers, we have tried sand blast and we have tried acids. The only thing we could find was this treatment with the acetylene torch which took off about a sixteenth of an inch of surface and then exposed an entirely new surface on the stones as

ad cabin ovalns on the edge. It means the installation of an entirely new feature which I think is entirely unneeded for any nearly a ten months out of all of the bridge except for the periods when [illegible] possibly at night. It means the blocking out of the existing cars and the lessening of the width of the existing roadway on the bridge [illegible] get all through you have derived about one-fourth of your the actual widening of the bridge are three-fourths of it to [illegible] of a new crown which in its width [illegible] to another [illegible] you a bulgement of one and two-eighths inches on the outer lane. [illegible] much accomplishment I don't believe you are improving the crown [illegible] to make in worthwhile because you still have very [illegible] still have some crown in your lanes anyhow. [illegible] [illegible] not widened, on the curve.

Since it has been built there [illegible] more than 10 million cars [illegible] the bridge and of those 10 million, I [illegible] conceivably, [illegible] could happen in any mile a mile of road anywhere in the world. [illegible] [illegible] would have saved that particular accident [illegible] questionable. I don't know, but I doubt it.

The introduction of new curves, the introduction of a [illegible] the crowns, the accomplishment of one and five-eighths inches in your outer section of the outer lane, the establishment of a [illegible] hope will probably lessen in some degree the [illegible] when it is wet but will be no better than [illegible] rather lessify and strongly as I have said to this [illegible] ought to do everything that we possibly could do, to preserve the [illegible] of the bridge since it is a [illegible] found to keep the pavement there -- even lessen the speed to 50 miles an hour if there are too many accidents. I do not want to belabor you with any more details and lines of reasoning, but I hope when you come to take [illegible] you will confirm your approval of the [illegible] and help us find some practical way of reducing the traffic or applying a treatment of some kind by continued maintenance to hold the surface as it now exists.

Chairman Bailey. Do you have sufficient force now properly so you could do everything about the surface?

Mr. Thompson. We could not run of our maintenance [illegible] The proper job of maintenance would require the [illegible] of the [illegible] is a job for 40 or 50 men and not two or three.

The funds now set up are for construction and [illegible] in the category of maintenance.

Chairman Bailey. I think one of the [illegible] to be to remove the speed limit.

Mr. Thompson. I have asked our police [illegible] this morning and they didn't have time to prepare a record of accidents so I asked for their best guess as to the reduction in accidents [illegible] passed 55 to 50 [illegible] cent, which is a considerable saving.

Mr. Gaylord. Would it not be proper to bring the surface up on the sides

Mr. Thompson. We have tried hard [illegible], we have invented a multiple jack hammer, we have tried draining them, we have tried pen [illegible], we have tried sand blast and we have water acids. The only thing we could find was this treatment with the acetylene torch which took off about a [illegible] of an inch of surface and then exposed an entirely new surface on the stones so

they exist. The difficulty with that was that it had to be done carefully because the heat of the torch softened up the joint material of asphalt and boiled it over, thereby more or less ruining the good effect that you accomplished by exposing the stone in the first place.

Mr. deWeldon. I think the heat would go into the stone as such and by freezing next winter it would crack the stone.

Mr. Thompson. We took samples of treated stone to the Bureau of Standards to make sure that the treatment did not affect the stone and it was satisfactory. The heat is so sudden and penetrates so shallow that it doesn't affect it.

Mr. Belluschi. What was the testing system.

Mr. Spelman. It was a highly scientific operation developed by Public Roads. According to their tests they determine the skid-proof qualities of the pavement.

Chairman Finley. Are there further questions?

General Grant, you have been associated with this and we would like to hear from you

STATEMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL U. S. GRANT, III

General Grant. When the bridge was built it was definitely a memorial, running between the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington House which is associated with General Lee. It was in fulfillment of President Jackson's idea of joining the North and the South with a bridge of granite arches. The Fine Arts Commission and architects were very particular about the width of the sidewalks. I pointed out at that time that the sidewalks would not be used very much and we would save some money if we made them narrower but there was no need of making them narrower unless we narrowed the whole bridge because we had the ample lane space that was called for by the project that had been approved, and that the pavement of the bridge would be an integral part of the bridge and not just a continuation of the street. The granite block was the answer to that and was in keeping and was adopted as the most suitable kind of pavement.

I gathered information everywhere I could about different kinds of pavement and certainly the information existing at that time indicated that the pavement would be less slippery than an asphalt pavement, even in wet weather. At that time the Camden Bridge had just been finished, in joining Camdem and Philadelphia, and they were having a great deal of trouble on the approaches where the slope is a little greater than the rest of the bridge and there was slipperiness. It seemed to us that the small blocks with the spaces between them would make a rougher pavement than the asphalt. If it isn't, that is surprising, but I think some of this is due to the bridge having been in use for 18 years without anything very much being done to it. Perhaps the relaying of the whole pavement every 18 or 20 years, just to take care of wear and tear with such a great number of cars going over it, is not an unnecessary or extreme job of maintenance, but it simply hasn't been done.

I have very much the feeling, as does Mr. Thompson also, that if you put an asphalt pavement over there you are going to destroy the character of the granite arched bridge across the Potomac and it would no longer be a monument but would just be another highway bridge.

Chairman Finley. Would you like to add anything, Mr. Spelman?

they exist. The difficulty with such was that it had to be made carefully because the heat of the bond softened up the joint material of asphalt and molded it over, thereby more or less ruining the good effect that you endeavor to accomplish the same in the first place.

Mr. Gardner. I think the left would go into a zone as such via by freezing near winter it would crack and [illegible].

Mr. Thompson. We took samples of tests [illegible] to the bureau of standards to make sure that the treatment did not affect the zone and it was satisfactory. The last in a sudden use [illegible] allow it doesn't affect it.

Mr. Bellamy. That was the bonding system.

Mr. Gardner. It was a highly economic operation developed by Mr. Mead. According to their tests they determine the [illegible] qualities of the pavement.

Chairman Farley. Are there further questions?

General Grant. You have been associated with this and a world life to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL U. S. GRANT, III

General Grant. When the bridge was built it was definitely [illegible] between the Lincoln Memorial and the Arlington Tunnel [illegible] with General Lee. It was in fulfillment of [illegible] of joining the North and the South with a memorial [illegible]. The Fine Arts Commission and architects were very particular about the width of the [illegible]. I mapped out at that time that the [illegible] would be [illegible] very much and we would have some money if we made them [illegible] no end of making the approaches [illegible] we improved the whole [illegible] we had the single lane space that was called for by the engineer [illegible] approved, and that the pavement of the bridge would be an integral part of the bridge and not just a continuation of the street. [illegible] the answer to that and we in meeting [illegible] kind of pavement.

I gathered information everywhere I could about various kinds of pavement and certainly the information existing at that time indicated that pavement would be less slippery than [illegible]. At that time the Dumbarton Bridge had just [illegible] philanthropists, and they are having a great deal of trouble on the approach where the slope is a little greater than the rest of the bridge and there is slipperiness. It seemed to me that the small [illegible] the horses [illegible] when [illegible] a rougher pavement than the asphalt. I [illegible], but it is surprising, but I think some of this is due to the [illegible] been in use for 18 years without requiring very much [illegible]. [illegible] laying of the whole pavement every 15 or 20 years. [illegible] one of many [illegible] with such a great number of cars go [illegible], is not an unnecessary or extreme job of maintenance, but it simply hasn't been done.

I have very much the feeling, as does Mr. Freeman also, that if you put an asphalt pavement over there you are going to destroy the character of the granite arched bridge across the Potomac and it would no longer be a monument but would just be another highway bridge.

Chairman Farley. Would you like to add anything, Mr. Gardner?

Mr. Spelman. I would like to make a further statement, Mr. Chairman.

I am sorry General Grant isn't here to hear me but I didn't want anything I had to say to reflect upon the actions of the original designers of the bridge. We must remember that there has been a good deal of change in highway technique and in the character of highway traffic since this bridge was designed.

For example, 25 years ago it is true that sheet asphalt pavement was quite slippery. I did not recommend that for this bridge. I recommended one of the asphalt types already on the approaches to the bridge, that surrounded the Lincoln Memorial and led up to the bridge. That is an asphalt mixture that has coarser particles in it than sheet asphalt. It is similar to the pavement that was constructed on the Mt. Vernon Highway from here to Alexandria.

Now in 1925 there was still at least some consideration being given to horse traffic. At the time the park pavements were unusually good for horse traffic because the crevices in the bridge gave the hooves of the horses a chance to catch. It was the practice that such pavements were more satisfactory. The technique of the construction of asphalt pavement is changed and the information I am giving you as far as the designers of the bridge are concerned is hind sight.

The business of crowns, bridge engineers and engineers generally have moved rather slowly in the direction of the crowns on pavements.

Mr. Thompson made one statement that is inaccurate. I want to correct it. We did not propose cutting down the crown of this bridge by an inch and a half, we proposed cutting it down two and a half to three inches which makes a great deal of difference. The crown on Memorial Bridge is eight inches. The crown of Bridge 6 of the Pentagon network built a few years ago is four inches, or half of that.

Another point that I think ought to be considered is that I did not say that the steepness of the crown was the whole factor that contributed to danger but I said it was one of the contributing factors. I think you can prove that for yourselves on this bridge. As far as what has to be done to the structure of the bridge to remove that crown is, as I pointed out, the central part of the bridge. The crown is not excessive, it is the parabola that throws an excess of crown into the outer quarters of the bridge, and while we have not completely studied that feature of it we believe that the adjustment of the metal plates will have to occur only in the outside quarters of the bridge. That is in the process of removing the crown.

As far as the adjustment of the drop inlets or catch basins are concerned, that is simply a question of raising them up so they are some inches higher than they are now.

Mr. Thompson raised the question of the substitute rail, or rather the secondary curb.

We find in modern bridge designs that the secondary curb effect is effective in keeping people from jumping the road. There is one curb of six to eight inches immediately adjacent. There is an offset and then there is a further curb a little way out.

We made a number of studies of treatments of that curb. That was simply one of four recommendations that we made. First to reduce the crown of the bridge. Secondly to change the type of pavement from the stone block to the type now in use around the approaches and around the memorial, and for the use of this secondary curb -- and we have sketches here of a great number of things.

Mr. Doelman. I would like to make a further statement, Mr. Chairman.

I am sorry General Grant could have to hear me but I didn't want any thing I had to say to reflect upon the actions of the original designers of the bridge. We must remember that there has been a good deal of change in highway technique and in the character of highway traffic since this bridge was designed.

For example, 25 years ago it is true that most engineers paved in granite slippery. I did not recommend that for this bridge. I recommended one of the asphalt types already on the approaches to the Lincoln Memorial and led up to the bridge. That is a that has coarser particles in it than asphalt pavements. pavement that was constructed on Bridge. Prior to Lincoln Memorial now in 1965 there was still at least some considerable horse drawn horse traffic. At the time the granite pavements were adequately good for horse traffic because the crevices in the bridge gave the horses of the chance to catch. It was the practice that such pavements were laccery. The technique of the construction of asphalt pavements and the information I am giving you as far as the development of are concerned is kind right.

The business of crowns, bridge engineers and engineers generally moved rather slowly in the direction of the crowns on pavements.

Mr. Thompson made one statement that is inaccurate. I said it. He did not propose cutting down the crown of this bridge by a and a half, he proposed cutting it down two and a half to three inches makes a great deal of difference. The crown on Memorial Bridge inches. The crown of Bridge 6 of the Pentagon roadway built is four inches, or half

Another point that I think ought to be that I did not say that the absence of the crown was the sole factor that contributed to danger but I said it was one of the contributing factors. prove that for yourselves on this bridge. As far as what has the structure of the bridge to remove that crown is, as I pointed out, central part of the bridge. The crown is not necessary, it is the that throws an excess or crown into the other structure of the bridge, and while we have not completely studied that feature of it we believe that adjustment of the metal plates will have to occur only in the outside tors of the bridge. That is in the process of removing the crown.

As far as the adjustment of the floor joints or other bracing and conserned, that is simply a question of raising them up so they are some higher than they are now.

Mr. Thompson raised the question of the sidewalks and, or rather the secondary curb.

He find in modern bridge designs that the secondary effective in keeping people from jaywalking the road. The six to eight inches immediately adjacent. There is is a further curb a little way out.

We made a number of studies of treatments of that curb. one of four recommendations that we made. We to replace the bridge. Secondly to change the type of pavement from the asphalt type now in use around the approaches and around the memorial, and use of this secondary curb -- and we have sketches here of a good number of

There is something that should be further studied in connection with that secondary curb. The purpose of the secondary curb was to prevent an accident of the type which occurred when a bus went through the rail. While that type of accident is very unlikely, it can be prevented in my judgment only by the use of this secondary curb or by development of some kind of a barrier along the rail itself, such as a sheet of metal that might be placed along the rail, painted so that it resembles the rail and that would keep vehicles from going through that rail again.

The rail on that bridge is stone on the main part of the bridge but it is metal painted to resemble stone on the draw span. It is a remarkable achievement in resemblance. As many times as I had crossed the bridge, I did not know that the draw span rail was of metal until I got to studying this particular problem. The average person going over the bridge I suppose doesn't know that.

I suppose that is all. General Grant, you did not hear all that I said. What I said while you were out was that I hoped nothing that I said at this time would be considered to be any reflection on the persons who designed the bridge. The technique of asphalt pavements, the knowledge of engineers concerning all types of pavements, and the nature of the traffic that bridges now carry is a great deal different than it was when that bridge was designed. I am talking from hind sight. The folks who built the bridge were doing the best they could according to their judgment at that time, and that this stone block pavement was thought to be just as you said, reasonably skid proof.

General Grant. There is one thing, Mr. Spelman, I would like to ask you. If you change the crown on the stone block pavement, there would then be an adjustment of the draws necessary because the draws and all the mechanism of the draws follow that same line.

Mr. Spelman. We checked that with Nagle and he said that could be done without any particular difficulty. On the draw spans you could patch out that crown.

Chairman Finley. Is there anything further?

Mr. Tolson. The Park Service has a problem on its hands with respect to resurfacing the bridge. The Bureau of Public Roads is the road building agency of the Government and handles the major road work for the National Park Service. We certainly wanted to give consideration to Mr. Spelman's opinion with respect to the surfacing.

In addition to that we have had several complaints about the present condition of the pavement across the bridge. Among them, one of the assistant secretaries of the Interior. We wanted to be sure that we are doing the right thing. Whether it is finally decided to use the granite block or whether it is decided to use the asphalt and concrete pavement. I understand the asphalt and concrete can be made in any color. It is not necessary to use the black asphalt which of course would be an intrusion into the memorial character of the bridge.

Chairman Finley. Would it be satisfactory to have a decision at our next meeting in November?

Mr. Tolson. Yes it would.

Chairman Finley. I thought perhaps the members would like to look over the bridge so they know exactly what the situation is.

Mr. Caemmerer. We will try to go there this afternoon and have a report at the next meeting.

There is something that should be further studied in connection with that [illegible] the type which occurred when a bus went through the rail. While that type of [illegible] use of this secondary curb or by development of some kind of a barrier along the rail itself, such as a sheet of metal that might be placed among the rail, painted so that it resembles the rail and that would keep vehicles from going through that rail again.

The rail on that bridge is stone on the main part of the bridge but it is metal painted to resemble stone on the down span. It is a remarkable achievement in resemblance. As many times as I had crossed the bridge, I did not know that the down span rail was of metal until I got to studying this particular problem. The average person going over the bridge I suppose doesn't know that.

I suppose that is all. General Grant, you did not hear all that I said. What I said while you were out was that I hoped nothing that I said at this time would be construed to be any reflection on the persons who drafted the [illegible].

[illegible] covering all types of pavements, and the nature of the traffic that bridges must carry is a great deal different when it was when that bridge was designed. I am talking from hind sight. The folks who built the bridge were doing the best they could according to their judgment at that time, and that white cobblock pavement was thought to be just as you said, reasonably skid proof.

General Grant. There is one thing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask you. If you change the crown on the stone block pavement, there would then be an adjustment of the crown necessary because the draws and all the mechanism of the draws follow that same line.

Mr. Sherman. We checked that with Eagle and he said that could be done without any particular difficulty. On the new spans you could point out that crown.

Chairman Finley. Is there anything further?

Mr. Tolson. The Park Service has a problem on its hands with respect to resurfacing the bridge. The Bureau of Public Roads is the road building agency of the Government and handles the major road work for the National Park Service. We certainly wanted to give consideration to Mr. Sherman's opinion with respect to the surfacing.

In addition to that we have had several complaints about the present condition of the pavement across the bridge. Among them, one of the assistant secretaries of the Interior. We wanted to be sure that we are doing the right thing. Whether it is finally decided to use the granite block or whether it is decided to use the asphalt and concrete pavement. I understand the asphalt which of course would be an intrusion into the memorial character of the bridge.

Chairman Finley. Would it be satisfactory to have a decision at our next meeting in November?

Mr. [illegible]

Chairman Finley. I thought perhaps the members would like to look over the bridge so they know exactly what the situation is.

Mr. Demaree. We will try to go there this afternoon and have a report at the next meeting.

Mr. Tolson. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. Hudnut. Why could we not have an asphalt pavement that looks exactly like granite blocks? If they can make a railing of metal and make it look like stone why couldn't they make blocks?

Chairman Finley. We will try to give you a decision at the next meeting then.

I think we are due at Octagon House. They are waiting for us at 1 o'clock.

General Grant. Would it not be possible if you relaid the granite blocks, to take that crown out to some extent and fill in under the outside at the curb?

Mr. Spelman. It would be possible just as it would be if you used asphalt. But in either event you would have to rework your expansion joints. They would have to be lifted out and laid on a new cross section, which helps you by one and five-eighths inches which didn't seem to me worthwhile.

Mr. Belluschi. If you have had no more accidents with one than the other, the solution is easier. I think there should be some more official or documented statement on that. It seems very important.

Mr. Spelman. Would it be of help to you if I were to furnish you the survey of our police studies over the last few years as contrasted with the other bridges and you could evaluate those lane for lane?

Mr. Tolson. Bear in mind the roughness of the bridge necessitated reducing the speed limit on the bridge in order to prevent accidents.

Mr. Belluschi. I know they have been experimenting for the last 25 years on bridge surfacing. I believe we can assume that there is no such animal as a high speed and perfect pavement.

Chairman Finley. Thank you very much. We will try to give you a decision as soon as we can.

STATEMENT OF H. J. SPELMAN

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Mr. Spelman. This problem came up to us some years ago with reference to the number of accidents which seem to occur on the Arlington Memorial Bridge. We made a study of it and we found that the granite block pavement is an extremely slippery type of pavement when wet.

We have made a number of skid tests on various types of paved areas. These show that while the granite block pavement is about equal in skid-resisting qualities to other types of pavement when dry, when wet it is by a considerable margin the most slippery pavement in this area. It is the most slippery type of pavement.

When the study was made we found there were other contributing factors to accidents besides the type of pavement. One was that the crown on the Memorial Bridge -- that is the transverse slope -- is extremely great. I think it is greater than that on any other bridge in this area. The crown is not a straight line but rather it increases as you go from the center of the bridge to the curb and the lane close to the curb has a very steep crown on it.

The curb itself is unusually high. Becuase of the high curb and probably the extreme steepness of the lane next to the bridge, traffic tends to shy away from the curb. When you have created a tendency for traffic to get out of one lane, that produces another element of danger.

Mr. Tolson. That would be satisfactory.

Mr. Hobson. Why could we not have an engineer to present what looks exactly like granite blocks? If they can make a matting of wood, and make it look like [illegible]

Chairman Finley. We will try to give you a decision on this item Monday then.

I think we are due in a Congress House. They are working hard on it I understand.

General Grant. Would it not be possible if you retain the granite blocks to make that cross on the street and let the market the question as to cost?

Mr. Spelman. It would be possible just as it would be if you used asphalt. But in either case you would have to remove your expansion joints. They would have to be lifted out and laid on a new cross section, which helps and five-eighths inches which does not seem to be worthwhile.

Mr. Pellegrini. If you have had no more accidents with one than with other, the solution is easier. I think there should be some more official or documented statement on that. It seems very important.

Mr. Spelman. Would it be of help to you if I were to furnish you the survey of our police studies over the last few years as contrasted with the other bridges and you can compare those lanes for lanes?

Mr. Tolson. Just in that the roughness of the bridge necessitated reducing the speed limit on the bridge in order to prevent accidents.

Mr. Pellegrini. I know they have been experimenting for the last on bridge surfacing. I believe we can assume that there is no such high speed and perfect pavement.

Chairman Finley. Thank you very much. We will try to give you a decision as soon as we can.

STATEMENT OF H. J. STROUD

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Mr. Spelman. This problem came up to us some years ago with reference to the number of accidents which seem to occur on the Arlington Memorial Bridge. We made a study of it and we found that the granite block pavement is an extremely slippery type of pavement when wet.

We have made a number of skid tests on various types of paved areas. These show that while the granite block pavement is about equal in skid-resisting qualities to other types of pavement when dry, when wet it is by considerable margin the most slippery pavement in this area. It is the most slippery type of pavement.

Upon the study was made we found there were other contributing factors to accidents besides the type of pavement. One was that the curve on the Memorial Bridge -- that is the transverse slope -- is extremely great. I think it is greater than that on any other bridge in this area. The curve is not a straight line but rather it increases as you go from the center of the bridge to the curb and the lane close to the curb has a very sharp curve on it.

The curb itself is unusually high. Because of the high curb and probably the extreme sharpness of the lane next to the curb, traffic tends to shy away from the curb. When you have created a tendency for traffic to get out of one lane, that produces another element of danger.

We studied the question of the approaches a little bit and we thought that some improvement might be made on the approaches to the bridge by a very slight cut, perhaps two or three feet on the sidewalk at each end for a distance of 50 or 60 feet onto the bridge, so as to improve the flow of traffic in and also we would pull the dividing island in further into the actual bridge itself.

We investigated the possibility of relaying the stone blocks now on the bridge. That could be done but we still can not escape the fact that the stone block pavement is still slippery when wet.

There is another factor that contributes to the discomfort of the public in traveling the bridge and probably to the danger and that is that through the years the stone block pavement has become very rough in its general coutour, that it is full of hollows and bumps. The Park forces have tried to improve that by relaying limited portions of the stone block but the efforts have not been successful. The difficulty seems to be inherent in the type of construction. The stone ~~xxxx~~ cubes are of irregular thickness. They are laid on a sand-cement cushion and then the surface is struck off to the correct contour and the required degree of smoothness and rolled. But as the traffic gets onto it, the irregular thickness of the block plus the irregular thickness of the cushion tends to work waves into the pavement over the course of time. There seems to be no way of avoiding that. Hence, it did not seem much would be accomplished by relaying the block because; first, the block is slippery when wet; secondly, the irregularities will again appear.

We looked into the ~~possibility~~ possibility of attempting to make the surface of the block more skid resistant by treatment. We treated a section of the pavement with a blow torch and that cracked the surface film, the polish of the block, and then we went back and made tests on that treated block when wet and when dry. We found the same results. That is that the treatment of the block didn't make any improvement in its nonresistance to skidding during the rainy season.

There is the situation then as we see it. If a considerable sum of money is spent to relay the block we still face the fact that we have an extremely slippery pavement.

Our recommendation made some years ago was that the bridge be paved with asphalt and that the crown be taken out of the bridge which can easily be done with asphalt by feather edging on the edges of the crown, to bring it to a crown normal for bridges presently designed. The bridges designed in the last few years are designed with a much flatter crown than those designed 25 years ago.

The recommendation contemplated using not a sheet asphalt, or the very black type of asphalt but rather the same type of asphalt pavement that is used on the approaches to the bridge. This isn't quite the same type of asphalt that is used on the draw spans. These asphaltic concrete pavements do not lose ~~much~~ as much of their skid resistant properties when wet as the stone block pavement.

I think that is the story, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Finley. That is what you would like to do with it?

Mr. Spelman. I can't say that is what I would like to do, if you are talking about my personal likes and dislikes. My recommendation had to be on the basis of the facts that to make the bridge safer, to make the roadway of the bridge safer, it would be desirable and necessary to change to another type of construction which would be less slippery and at the same time to take out some of the crown and reduce the height of the curb.

We studied the question of the approach. A little bit and we thought that some improvement might be made on the approaches to the bridge by a very slight cut, perhaps two or three feet on the sidewalk at each end for a distance of 50 or 60 feet onto the bridge, so as to improve the flow of traffic in and also we would pull the dividing island in another time to a normal width.

We investigated the possibility of relaying the stone blocks now on the bridge. That could be done but it still does not secure the fact that the stone block pavement is still slippery when wet.

There is another factor that contributes to the discomfort of people in traveling the bridge and would be the danger and that is that years the stone block pavement has become very rough in the general [illegible] that it is full of hollows and dips. The [illegible] to improve that by relaying limited portions of the stone block [illegible] have been successful. The difficulty seems to be inherent in the type of construction. The stone blocks are of irregular dimensions. They are laid on a sand-cement cushion and then the mortar is forced out to the current contours and the required degree of roughness and [illegible] it, the irregular thickness of the block [illegible] cushion tends to work away [illegible] the pavement [illegible] seems to be no way of avoiding that. Hence, it will not be much worth [illegible] accomplished by relaying the block pavement. That, the block is [illegible] wet; secondly, the irregularities will again appear.

We looked into the [illegible] possibility of resurfacing to make the surface of the block more and resistant to pressure. We tested a section of the pavement with a thin crust and that crust of the surface [illegible] of the block, and then we went back and made tests [illegible] wet and when dry. We found the same results. [illegible] block didn't make any improvement in the noisiness or [illegible] rainy season.

There is the situation [illegible] to see it. It's considerable [illegible] is apart to repay the block [illegible] the last [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] are [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

C O P Y

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

3 Japanese kakemono -- portraits. Attributed to Fujiwara Nobuzane, 1176-1268.

1 Brass chandelier, inlaid with silver and copper, with lions and inscriptions. Mosul, 13th century.

1 Stone stele, Kuan Yin. Chinese, Northern Ch'i.

2 Stone sculptures (a pair) representing demons. Chinese, Six Dynasties. From Hsiang-t'ang-shan,

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

David E. Finley
For the Commission of Fine Arts

Oct. 6, 1950

EXHIBIT L

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 9, 1950

My dear George:

Thank you for your letter of October 7th which I found on my desk this morning, together with a copy of LIFE Magazine for October 9th containing reproductions of paintings by United States combat artists made in Korea five years ago. I had noticed these paintings in LIFE after our talk about the subject on Friday, and agree with you that it might be useful to show them to General Marshall. I shall be delighted if you will talk with him about the possibility of assigning other combat artists to the war zone in Korea. This would be a much better way to approach the subject than to send a letter to the General which might be turned down. You could tell him that The Commission of Fine Arts discussed the matter, and we would be glad to have you explore it further with him.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley
Chairman.

Mr. George Biddle
"Ashacres"
Croton-on-Hudson
New York

EXHIBIT M

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 13, 1950

Dear Mr. Larson:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on October 6, 1950, Mr. George Biddle, eminent painter member of the Commission, strongly urged that a nation-wide program be adopted as pertaining to public buildings, to provide for their embellishment by paintings and sculpture. The project would be similar to that in operation about a decade ago through what was known as the Section of Fine Arts, under supervision of the Public Buildings Administration. Instead of a Section of Fine Arts, Mr. Biddle suggests that the Public Buildings Administration have charge of plans and contracts, but that designs and models for painting and sculpture be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for aesthetic advice, as well as the selection of artists. The Public Buildings Administration now does this occassionally, or when some controversial problem is involved. The proposed plan would provide for regular submissions in all instances, and to this end the Commission of Fine Arts suggest the issuance of an Executive Order by the President on the subject. We trust this will meet with your approval.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Hon. Jess Larson, Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington, D. C.

October 15, 1950

Dear Mr. Larson:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on October 6, 1950, Mr. George Biddle, eminent painter member of the Commission, strongly urged that a nation-wide program be adopted as pertaining to public buildings, to provide for their embellishment by paintings and sculpture. The project would be similar to that in operation about a decade ago through what was known as the Section of Fine Arts, under supervision of the Public Buildings Administration. Instead of a Section of Fine Arts, Mr. Biddle suggests that the Public Buildings Administration have charge of plans and contracts, but that designs and models for painting and sculpture be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for aesthetic advice, as well as the selection of artists. The Public Buildings Administration now does this occasionally, or when some controversial problem is involved. The proposed plan would provide for regular submissions in all instances, and to this end the Commission of Fine Arts suggest the issuance of an Executive Order by the President on the subject. We trust this will meet with your approval.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.

David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Hon. Jess Larson, Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT N